THE ARYAN PATH

Point out the "Way"—however dimly, and lost among the host—as does the evening star to those who tread their path in darkness.

—The Voice of the Silence

VOL. XIII AUGUST 1942 No. 8

TRUTH VERSUS THE WILL TO BELIEVE

Complete intellectual honesty is among the rarest of human qualities. With most men, truth which conflicts with preconceptions or challenges prejudice has scant chance of a hearing. How often the opportunity to prove or to disprove a belief is deliberately evaded! An instinct, half-protective, half-defensive, prompts the millions of devotees of a Personal God to avoid putting Him too sharply to the test. There is not a Personal God of any religion who does not fail to live up to the promises made on His behalf by priests who claim the right to speak for Him. A man who fails to fulfil the terms of his contract, if he is not the victim of circumstances beyond his present control, is recognised as guilty of a breach of faith and other men are hesitant to deal with him in future. Not so when God fails those who serve Him most punctiliously. The faithful may fulfil to the letter all the conditions they are told their God demands, but when the due response is not forthcoming, instead of taxing Him with bad faith or with impotence, they evade the issue with pious excuses. "His ways are past finding out." "He doeth all things well." "These things are mysteries into which it is not lawful to enquire."

One man who ultimately recovered from such mental paralysis confessed that as a deeply religious youth he had given up praying with the half-realised motive, which he certainly would not have admitted at the time, of saving God's face. God did not answer prayers even for things it would have seemed very easy for Him to arrange and even apparently to His interest as well. Obviously He couldn't manage it. It seemed to the lad unkind to keep putting God in positions where His impotence was made so plainly obvious. He felt sorry for the Deity. For years he kept to himself his discovery that God was ineffectual. For a long time he went to church more assiduously than before, but he left off prayers for specific things as unfair to God, not sporting, as it were.

What are such expedients but a defence mechanism for beliefs intuitively recognised as not sufficiently robust to withstand frank challenge? The blind believer shrinks from facing facts as owls avoid the sun. He prefers resting undisturbed in what he wants to think. To the orthodox of any creed a universe of law, just and unerring, seems chill, inhospitable. Cause and effect offer a dreary substitute for the glamourous possibilities of miracle. So in all ages men have let their fancy range in wish-fulfilment dreams and scouted facts that negatived their cherished beliefs.

The infantile mind has always resented opposition and refused to recognise any law transcending its desires. Many people grow up incredulous that men and circumstances will not ultimately bend before their will. Our civilisation is full of adults whose attitude to life is still that of spoiled and petted children. When they meet opposition from their fellows or from their environment, such men and women instinctively turn for backing to a higher power, as in their infancy they demanded and received enforcement of their thwarted wishes through the intervention of parent or of nurse. The *deus ex machina* is invoked, as in ancient drama, to descend to disentangle the confusion of events and bring his devotee to victory.

But that most convenient device of the ancient dramatist to further the action of the play has no counterpart in real life. Causes once set in motion will sweep inevitably to their due effect as the breaking wave spreads itself out on the sandy shore. No intensity of hope or fervency of prayer can turn the wave back till its force is spent. No power on earth or in heaven can make the fusion of two parts of hydrogen and one part of oxygen anything but water; as the gun is pointed when the trigger is pulled, so the bullet will fly; the apple-tree will bear apples, the mango-tree mangoes; so it always has been and so it ever will be. The law works throughout the physical universe—no effect without its due cause, no cause set up that does not produce its effect. Logic and universal experience point to the identity of this law of action and reaction with the moral law and to the impossibility of any legerdemain, human or divine, averting the destiny which each has sown and must in due course reap.

Belief in a Personal God and in the efficacy of intercessory prayer flouts the Law, as it belittles Deity, the divine principle of omnipresent Life. Such belief substitutes a caricature for the majestic concept of the Boundless and Unknowable. It pictures God as a celestial sleight-of-hand performer who could, if he but would, at any time produce a rabbit out of a high hat or other gape-seed for the credulous. Faith in such a God may make life more interesting for the immature, but such a faith at best gives a factitious sense of freedom from the law, as drugs may make the prisoner forget his

bars. In fact, sincere belief that one can so transcend the laws of nature as to escape the consequences of his acts, whether by unaided effort or through appeal to a heavenly ally, is a form of megalomania no less pathetic because it is so common.

The most unfortunate effect of the Personal God complex, however, is not this delusion of greatness which it fosters. Megalomania *per se* is relatively harmless. But the logical deduction from the fallacy that legitimate results can be turned aside is that the motive and the course of action do not greatly matter. That is a fatal error. The world today is reaping in misery and confusion the results of centuries of action on this false notion and of failure to recognise that with power, always and everywhere, goes corresponding responsibility.

The lesson has not yet been learned. The average man still prefers comfortable mental inertia to intellectual effort. Comparatively few can echo sincerely the noble words of Emerson, " I covet truth. " The power of passive resistance is never more clearly illustrated than when blind faith is challenged by an uncongenial fact. The will to believe is the most implacable foe of truth. Fact and logic are alike powerless against an intense will to believe in that which their testimony contradicts. Illogical and dangerous, therefore, as are belief in a Personal God and the resulting denial of the universality and impersonality of Law, they will persist as long as men desire to be deceived.

But the religious devotee is by no means the only blind believer. The average scientist, however open his mind in his own laboratory, offers an impregnable front to facts which negative his basic conceptions. The attitude of almost all the little men of science, and of many of the so-called great as well, towards well-attested psychic phenomena is strongly reminiscent of the reaction of the ignorant old man who on his first sight of a giraffe stoutly declared that there could be no such animal. Suggest to such a scientist that the Wise Men of the East, ancient or modern, may have possessed or may possess today truth far beyond the ken of Western science of the present time—and observe his reaction !

The technique of meeting truth which comes from an unpopular source and which conflicts with preconceived ideas is well developed : to deny as long as possible ; to ignore what can no longer be denied ; and, when neither denial nor ignoring quashes unwelcome truth, to attack the *bona fides* of whoever stated it. Few men indeed among the ranks of either scientists or churchmen of whatever creed observe the wise ancient injunction : " Never utter these words : ' I do not know this —therefore it is false.' One must study to know, know to understand, understand to judge. "

THE INDIAN POET'S POET

[We are glad to welcome among our contributors **Shri K. Chandrasekharan,** a well-known scholar and advocate of South India. He brings out here an important aspect of our common interdependence, the affinity that asserts itself, in terms of consubstantiality, between men of like mind regardless of the centuries that separate them in time. The spiritual *Guruparampara* Chain has its æsthetic analogue.—ED.]

When Matthew Arnold wrote his sonnet on Shakespeare beginning with the lines,

> Others abide our question; thou art free
> We ask and ask; thou standest still
> Out-topping knowledge,

his intense perception of the truth about Shakespeare's greatness impressed all the literary minds of the world. Scholars and professors of English making Shakespeare their favourite study marked every line of it as significant. We, the "compulsorily educated ones" in the foreign language, began to glow with pride that Shakespeare had made "the Heaven of Heavens his dwelling place." Some of us, while taking occasional peeps into the magic world of Sanskrit, also came under the spell of that master of English. Our partiality for our own Kalidasa sought to raise his status in the international world by comparing his comprehensive range of thought with that of the English dramatist. We could not feel happy until a profound observation of the one on life or a bewitching simile of the other drawn from nature, convinced the reader that the poets, both of England and India, never exclusively belonged to any particular place or clime.

No doubt the universality of a poet marks the peak of his glory. Otherwise his mission on earth misses its true objective. But to understand a poet fully, one needs must be more than a literary person. "He must be great to describe the greater" said Emerson, describing a good biographer. The same must hold good in the case of poets also. To understand a poet's heart one must have in him all the faculties which make for such abundance in the other. When Rabindranath Tagore makes out the crowning philosophy of Kalidasa's life in the meaning of his *Megha-Sandesa,* where we, ordinary men, sense only the passion of a Yaksha's yearning for his beloved, it makes all the difference between the prose and the poetry of thought hidden in it.

Tagore's reverence for Kalidasa is based upon the more ancient bond that knit Kalidasa so closely to Valmiki. The Ādikavi was to Kalidasa what he himself is to Tagore. In many a verse of his, Kalidasa reminds us of the pure springs of beauty and creativity in Valmiki which he has tasted and made others

also taste. Similarly, Tagore is never tired of resuscitating Kalidasa's perfect art of blending life and nature in an exquisite phrase or metaphor. In song and drama, he loves to recall his predecessor's unfailing rendering of the tunes and cadences of the human heart. If nature was to Kalidasa the one supreme helpmate to the eternal soul in its path of self-realization, to Rabindranath equally was it "the giver of immortal gifts" and the "giver of the power of renunciation." If Tagore's imagination conjured up for us "Urvasi" as the light of heaven fascinating the earth, it was Kalidasa's wizardry that led the way to Tagore's abstract ideas taking concrete forms and figures. If Eternal Good was to wed Power, then, Kalidasa felt, it should be after Power or Sakti got purified of its passion. Hence was Uma, the mountain-born, spurned in anger by the Lord of the Universe, because she had not known yet her own integrity by penance and severe austerities. But as soon as her inner light radiated with the power born of restraint and love, she was espoused by the God himself in boonful companionship.

To read into every one of Kalidasa's writings a hidden meaning and a motif, may not always appeal to the dilettante whose satisfaction is complete with the dulcet sounds of the sonorous Sanskrit and the imageries of Oriental imagination. But the earnest soul that lives upon the true and the ultimate reality behind all forms, may not stop till its goal is reached. We can account for Tagore's fresh interpretations of Kalidasa to his own soul steeped in *Rasa-Dhvani* (thought-suggestion), which is the soul of all art. Without any fond display of originality, Tagore pours out a "tiny stream, weaving in its murmur the memory of our parting moment" from all that was once our priceless possession.

The *Megha-Duta* of Kalidasa strikes every intelligent reader of Sanskrit poetry as a poem of remarkable workmanship. Beyond the wail of a lover separated from his sweetheart, it leaves on the ordinary reader little more than a rich intoxication of metre and music. To Rabindranath the Yaksha is no mere lover cursed by his master to live in exile away from his love, but the incarnation of the human soul in misery, when bereft of the spiritual life with which it longs to join. It is the dream and the object of the hungering heart to fill itself with plenty. Tagore surmises that Kalidasa himself bewails the poverty of spirituality that comes upon mankind with their exodus to the city. The forest life that was Kalidasa's dream was nowhere near him at the Court of Ujjain. Across the lines of a love-song flit the sad reveries of a hungering soul pining for things which were once its own. The following verse of the poet of Shanti-Niketan condenses his thought about the origin and the theme of the *Megha-Sandesa*. Per-

haps, nowhere in the whole gamut of literary criticism written so far on Kalidasa could there be found such newness of interpretation :—

At youth's coronation, Kalidasa,
You took your seat, your beloved by your side,
In Love's primal paradise.
Earth spread its emerald green carpet beneath your feet,
the sky held over your heads
its canopy gold-embroidered;
the seasons danced round you
carrying their winecups of varied allurements,
the whole universe yielded itself to your loneliness of delight,
leaving no trace of human sorrows and sufferings
in the immense solitude of your bridal chamber.
Suddenly God's curse descended from on high
hurling its thunderbolt of separation
upon the boundless detachment of youth's egotism.
The seasons' ministry in a moment was ended
When the veil was wrenched from love's isolation
and on the tear-misted sky appeared the pageantry of the rainy world of June
across which journeyed the sad notes of your bereaved heart
towards a distant dream. [1]

"The distant dream" can be no less than the spiritual balm for the soul immersed in materialism. Because, what life gives we spurn; what nature offers we miss; what beauty teaches we heed not.

For it is a desperate age of hurry and hustle
and the lyric muse has to take her journey
to her tryst of hearts
on trams and buses.

The cry of Kalidasa was for the distant dream of a hopeful age. But the age of Kalidasa, curiously enough, was to Tagore the Golden Age. "I am hopelessly born in the age of the busy printing-press—a belated Kalidasa, and you, my love, are utterly modern." So what was more ancient is the sole dream of the modern poet. Nevertheless thought which is ever fresh is never ancient. Tagore knew that Kalidasa's spiritual urge was actuating him in every line and song that he composed. And we understand Tagore's heart feeling the same sadness and want in the midst of seeming plenty. Felicitous expression was not enough for him to remain unaffected in his pride of a poet's life. He kissed the dust where the footprints of his own God were left. He paid with his sorrows the price of this initiation into a greater life.

K. CHANDRASEKHARAN

[1] *Poems.* By RABINDRANATH TAGORE. (Visva-Bharati Book-shop, Calcutta)

UNITY

[We agree with **Miss Elizabeth Cross** that unity among men, irrespective of race, creed, sex and condition, in short, of all the false or artificial distinctions made in the world, is the great desideratum. We go so far as to accept as the criterion of every proposed reform whether it will tend to promote that true universal brotherhood. But any effort to achieve unity must fail unless those who make it have succeeded in some measure in killing out in themselves the " great dire heresy of separateness " from which all evil springs.—ED.]

Never has the world more needed unity of purpose towards good-will, but so far the greatest unity has been shown by those of evil purpose. We know the truth of the old proverb " Unity is strength," while we have had new and bitter emphasis on the cynical advice to " divide and rule."

The pre-war years found the democratic countries being more and more parcelled out into little sets and cliques, exclusive classes and intolerant groups. While preparation was going on for their gradual destruction, the woolly-minded in England and America were perfectly comfortable attending lectures concerning their own pet interests, entertaining the kind of people that reflected their own upbringing, carefully ignoring any need for social service or for taking a vital part in the reform of education, labour conditions or the general economic chaos.

The Fascist countries may have achieved a false and possibly a merely temporary unity, but for the moment it is sufficient for us to recognise its efficiency. We should not delude ourselves into the happy belief that this unity is entirely false, merely because we disapprove of the methods by which it was achieved. It may be a unity based on undesirable ideals and beliefs, but the fact that is important for us is that the people have been led to admire these beliefs and to wish to live up to these ideals. The undesirable beliefs and ideals are not exclusive to any small set or class; they are wide-spread and create a comforting atmosphere of union.

As an ideal, " unity " must mean unity in the attitude towards those values that have a universal approval. There can be argument and discussions concerning what these values may be, but we have sufficient guidance from the great teachers of all times and nations to set us on the right path. In fact, it is mere quibbling on our part to pretend that we do not know something of these worth-while values. There is no excuse for the parent who fails to set a right example or to live in an inspiring manner. We cannot plead ignorance merely because we are not able to accept every dogma of our national religion; we know very well what are the basic truths that

underlie any coating of superstition or legend.

It may be helpful to examine some causes of our lamentable " disunity " in order to find out how our failings may be remedied in the future. What have we done or left undone to bring us to the state of distrust that prevailed when first one and then another nation failed to unite with the rest in time to save themselves from a common enemy? What have we done to deserve citizens who are so untrustworthy that the State considers it necessary to deprive them of their freedom? It may well be that many of those so deprived are undeserving of their fate, yet the suspicious atmosphere is abroad that makes it all possible. Again, we have evidence of grave disunity among the workers of our democratic countries, strikes, compulsion, differences between labour and management, differences between management and government departments. In England many of these differences have now disappeared under threat of danger, but it is to be feared that without considerable changes this disunity would reappear if danger departed.

The lack of a common religion is a serious contributory factor to this disunity, and it is quite useless to hope for a revival of ancient forms and ceremonies that have lost their meaning for the majority. There have been occasional rushes to special services, but they partake more of the nature of superstition and " totemism " than of any true religious feeling. The general atmosphere is entirely non-religious, with a semi-savage consciousness that " there may be something in it, " and so, in addition to astrology, fortune-telling and so on, there is an occasional attempt at prayer and at church attendance.

In general, organised religion also contributes to disunity by reason of its many sects and special creeds. Many modern religious teachers have made great efforts to emphasise the common factors of, for instance, the Christian religion, but the majority are content to go on in their own particular rut. The comparative few who take part in any active religious exercises are often content with their own small section and show no interest or sympathy with those outside the particular flock. They seem completely unaware that there exist those " other sheep " of whom Jesus Christ spoke. In return, the " other sheep " find the church-goers narrow and intolerant and decide to stay outside the fold to enjoy themselves in their own way and to risk any wolves that may come along!

Modern conditions in general, particularly ease of travel, the convenience of the telephone, etc., all make it possible for people to ignore their near neighbours and to come in contact only with those who are particularly congenial to them. They have little or no knowledge of the life of those who have different work, different tastes or different

accents from their own. They tend to judge by appearances; the well-to-do fear the shabby, while the shabby often envy and despise the well-to-do. The old life of village and neighbourhood, when all met at church and at work, with the interdependence of craftsmen and housewives, has gone, and we have found nothing worth-while to put in its place.

In England, now, there seems some hope of a breaking down of barriers by reason of the national effort, conscription and general war work. Transport is growing restricted and a local social life, based on mutual service, is beginning to appear. Naturally this is not being achieved without great difficulty and friction, but here and there real friendships begun at work and continued in the home, are springing up between very dissimilar types of people. Class is becoming less important and more worth-while values are the standard of judgement. Again, with restricted buying power, material wealth is less important also, while creative gifts are coming into their own again.

What can we do to encourage these germs of unity, what must we try to resist in the way of useless traditions? First and most important, surely, is to make every effort to help achieve a truly "public" school system. The founders of our ancient Public schools meant them for the people, for boys who deserved the kind of education they provided. They were certainly not intended for a privileged class in the sense of a wealthy class. To-day we believe that a certain standard of education is proper to every child, regardless of his parents' capacity to pay for it. Let us now go further and refuse to waste any money, space or teachers' time on special education for children merely because a parent is ready to pay large sums for this. Education should be suited to the child, not to the parents' whims. Every child, regardless of wealth, should attend the right type of school for his age and abilities, and should also receive the appropriate type of academic or technical training to follow this schooling. We must stop segregating our children into completely artificial divisions merely because some are wealthier than others.

In the actual schools the teachers have the greatest chance of all in promoting general unity by emphasising the common needs and aims of mankind instead of dwelling on superficial differences. Men may differ as to the colour of their skins and the kind of buildings they may live in, but they have all the same digestive systems and the same desire for happiness, excitement and power. We may go even further and emphasise the amazing similarities to be traced throughout the whole of creation, our kinship with the lowliest organisms, both vegetable and animal. More time given to Nature Study and Biology and less to detailed military history would have a profound effect on

young and plastic minds.

In addition to throwing our children into contact with each other during their school-days it does seem worth-while to consider some scheme by which each one should render special service to the community. This need not be by any regimented scheme, but should be so arranged that parents will be glad to encourage a voluntary system of work that would operate in each neighbourhood. There is no reason why we should need a world war to show us the necessity for social service and real effort for the community, but it has worked out that way. Now boys and girls are to be encouraged to join various organisations that will help their country. In peace they need similar encouragement to help their neighbours. These neighbours must gradually become part of a larger circle, so that eventually we shall be as ready to work hard to aid a famine area in China or in India as we are to help ourselves today.

There can be no true sympathy and unity without actual experience of others' conditions; therefore the young citizen does need to spend some time (possibly during holidays from his technical or college course) in actual work with those who undertake our hardest and least rewarded tasks. Why shouldn't every physically fit boy work for a while in a coal-mine, as a farm labourer, on a fishing vessel and so on ? There could be choice as to which arduous occupation he should try, but it would be a salutary experience for all. Girls would benefit in the same way by working in a factory, a hospital, a laundry or some other place that called for physical labour.

If we are to make something worth-while of the world we need to achieve unity of fundamental interests. This cannot be done by passing resolutions or by joining societies where we meet only those of our own intellectual and social class. We must, each on his own, try to make contact with all fellow human beings, to make a friendly appeal to the basic human nature that underlies all veneer of education or of nationality. We must sink our own treasured prejudices and see whether we haven't something in common with everyone we meet. At the same time we must try to pass on the idea of unity, by refraining from gossip and by helping on general neighbourliness. We can do most of all by helping the children and young people to join in activities outside their immediate circle and by introducing them to the larger world of common humanity.

ELIZABETH CROSS

WHITHER MAN?

[Neither **Shri Nolini Kanta Gupta,** the well-known Bengali essayist, nor **Dr. J. N. Chubb** is a stranger to ARYAN PATH readers. We bring together here their articles, on themes more closely related than might appear on cursory examination, because in juxtaposition they bring out interestingly the contrast between the typically Indian metaphysical approach and the Western philosophical one.

Evolution is too often regarded as a closed chapter. That water can rise no higher than its source is an elementary physical proposition. The orthodox evolutionist, by tacitly denying the application of the principle to his field, flouts the clue of analogy which alone can guide him through the labyrinth of Nature. Without prior involution in matter, how could the potencies of Spirit or of Life unfold in the physical world ? And if all is, as the Ancients claimed, an emanation from the Highest, the impersonal Deity, surely the present stage can and must be vastly transcended before we rise to the level of our Source. It is of the higher levels of human evolution that both these articles treat.—ED.]

I.—AN ASPECT OF EMERGENT EVOLUTION

The theory of Emergent Evolution should be considered no longer as a theory, but as a statement of fact. The fact, at its barest, stripped of all assumptions and even generalisations, is the fact observed and implicit in all evolution, which can be denied only by the perverse and the purblind. It is this, that at each crucial step Nature undergoes a sudden and total change, brings forth a new element which was not there before and which could not be foreseen or foretold by any process of deduction from the actual factors in play.

At the very outset of the evolutionary march, when Material Nature meant only a mass or masses of incandescent gaseous elements, the first miracle that happened was the formation, the advent, of water. There was Hydrogen and there was Oxygen existing and moving side by side, for millions of years perhaps ; but only at a given moment did an electric current happen to pass through a certain mixture of the two elements somewhere, and behold, a liquid drop was the product, an absolutely new, unforeseen, unpredictable and wonderful object ! Examples can be multiplied.

The fact is admitted, on the whole, unless one is a Fundamentalist and prefers still to live in the consciousness of a bygone century. Difference comes in when the question of explanations and of view-points regarding them is raised. A materialist like Professor Broad would consider Mind and Life as fundamentally formations of Matter, however different they might seem from each

other and from the latter. Water, the so-called miracle-product of Oxygen and Hydrogen, according to him, is as material as these two; even so, Life and Mind, however miraculously produced, being born of Matter, are nothing but the same single reality, only in different forms. Others, who are more or less idealists, Alexander and Lloyd Morgan, for example (some of them call themselves neo-realists, however), would not view the phenomenon in the same way. Alexander says that Matter and Life and Mind are very different from each other; they are truly emergents, that is to say, novelties; but how the thing has been possible, one need not inquire; one should accept the fact with "natural piety."

Morgan proffers an explanation. He says that whatever there is, exists in God who is the all-continent. In fact, everything that is or was or shall be is in Him. And the evolutionary gradation expresses or puts in front, one by one, all the principles or types of existence that God holds in Himself. The explanation hardly explains. It simply posits the existence of Matter and Life and Mind and whatever is to come hereafter in the infinity of God, but the passage from one to another, the connecting link between two succeeding terms, and the necessity of the link, are left as obscure as before. Life is tagged onto Matter and Mind is tagged onto Life in the name of the Lord God.

Bertrand Russell made a move in the right direction with a happy suggestion which unhappily he had not the courage to follow up. Mind (and Life), he says, are certainly emergents out of Matter; that is because the reality is neither, it is a neutral stuff out of which all emergents issue. The conclusion is logical and sensible. But as he was initially bound to his position of scientific scepticism he could not further question or probe the "neutral" and stopped on the fence.

The problem in reality, however, is simple enough, if we allow the facts to speak for themselves and do not hesitate to accept the conclusions to which they inevitably lead. After Matter came Life; that is to say that out of Matter came Life, and that can only be because Life was involved in Matter. And if such a conclusion makes of Matter a potentially living thing, we shall have to accept the position. In the same way, Mind that followed Life came out of Life, because Mind was involved in Life; and if that means endowing Life with a secret mentality, well, there is no help for it. And if, as a natural consequence of the two premisses we have to admit the existence of some kind of mind or consciousness secreted in Matter—a mininal psychic life, according to McDougall—that would be but what the *Upanishads* always declared: Creation is a vibration of consciousness, and all things and all kinds of existence are only forms and modalities of consciousness.

However, we thus arrive at Mind

in following the evolutionary process. Now after Mind there emerges another principle which has been termed Deity. By Deity the emergent evolutionists mean the embodiment of the religious feeling—piety, charity, worship, love of God or of God's creatures. Indeed, saints and prophets are visible deities, embodiments of the Deity in the making. These represent another element in the evolutionary process—a new evolute.

Does this point to the emergence of a new type of superhuman beings forming a class or a species by themselves ? The possibility has been envisaged by some of the protagonists of emergent evolution, but has not been sufficiently examined or considered. Philosophers seem to walk in this region with caution and incertitude, as if on quicksand and quagmire. But in this connection we are faced with a problem which Morgan had the happy intuition to seize and to bring forward. It is our purpose to draw attention to this matter.

Professor Alexander spoke of the emergence of deities who would embody emergent properties other than those manifest in the Mind of man. Morgan asks whether there is not also a Deity—or *the* Deity—in the making. He establishes the logical necessity of such a consummation in this way: The evolutionary urge (or *nisus*, as it has been called) in its upward drive creates and throws up on all sides, at each stage, forms of the new property or principle of existence that has come into evidence. These multiple forms may appear anywhere and everywhere; they are strewn about on the entire surface of Nature. These are, however, the branchings of the evolutionary nisus which has a central line of advance running through the entire gradation of emergents : it is, as it were, the central pillar round which is erected a many-storeyed edifice. The interesting point is this, that at the present stage of emergence, what the central line touches and arrives at is the Deity. Or, again, the thing can be viewed in another way. At the bottom the evolutionary movement is broad-based on Matter but as it proceeds upward its extent is gradually narrowed down; Life is less extensive than Matter and Mind is still less extensive than Life. Thus the scheme of the movement can be figured as a pyramid—the base of the pyramid represents Matter, but the apex where the narrowing sides converge is what is called the Deity.

What is the implication of such a conclusion ? It comes perilously near the Indian conception of Avatarhood ! The central line of evolutionary nisus is the line of Avatarhood. At each point of the line, on the level of the newly emerged principle, there is a divine embodiment of that principle. The esoteric significance of the graded scale of Avatarhood, as illustrated in Vishnu's ten Forms, has long ago been pointed out, by Vivekananda, I think, in this light.

The principle of Avatarhood stands justified in this scheme as a necessary and inevitable element in the terrestrial evolutionary movement. An Avatar embodies a new emergent property : he incarnates a new principle of being and consciousness, he manifests—unfolds from below or brings down from above upon earth—a higher and deeper principle of organisation. He is the nucleus round which the new organisation crystallises. A Rama comes and human society attains a new status : against a mainly vitalistic and egoistic organisation whose defender and protagonist is Ravana, is set up an ideal of sattwic humanity. A Krishna appears and human consciousness is lifted, potentially at least, to a still higher level of spiritual possibility. The Avatar following, rather tracing, in his upward movement the central line of the evolutionary nisus, cuts a path, as it were, in the virgin forest of a realm of consciousness still unknown and foreign to human steps. As the Avatar presses and passes on, the way is cleared for other, ordinary human beings to come up and naturalise themselves in a new country promising a higher destiny which He discovers and conquers—for them.

Now at this point we reach the crux of the problem, the supreme secret—*Rahasyam uttamam*—as the *Gita* would say. For the apex of the pyramid, the crown of evolution, the consummation of the central line of emergence would then be nothing less than the manifestation, the terrestrial incarnation of the Supreme Divine. The Deity thus fully emerged would embody the truth and play of creation in its widest scope and highest elevation ; it would mean the utter fulfilment of human destiny and terrestrial Purpose.

In Indian terminology, it would be the advent of the Purna Bhagawan in the human body—*manushim tanumasritam*. All previous Avatars are only a preparation for the coming of this Supreme Divine. It is said also that the present epoch marks a crucial turn and transition. We await the Kalki Avatara who will wipe off the past, the Iron Age, and bring in the Golden Age, Satya Yuga.

A question inevitably arises here —what next ? Once the evolutionary movement has reached the apex, does it stop there ? After the apex, the Void ? It need not be so. The completion of the pyramid would mean simply the end of a particular order of creation, the creation in ignorance. This is, indeed, what Sri Aurobindo envisages in his conception of the creation in supramental Gnosis. The evolutionary nisus, on its arrival at the apex, according to him crosses a borderland, leaps into another order of world, the world of infinite Truth-Consciousness. Thereafter another new creation starts, the building perhaps of another pyramid (if we want to continue the metaphor). The progression of the evolutionary course is naturally expected to be an

unending series. The pyramids rise tier upon tier *ad infinitum*. Only it is to be noted that in the basic pyramid the evolution starts from inconscience and moves from more ignorance to less ignorance through a gradually lessening density of darkness until the apex is reached where all shade of darkness is eliminated for ever. Beyond there is no mixture, however thin and diluted : it is a movement from light to light, from one expression of it to another, perhaps richer, but of the same quality.

This, however, is an aspect of the problem with which we are not immediately concerned. There is one question with which we have omitted to deal but which is nearer to us and touches present actualities. We spoke of the emergence of the Deity—and of the Supreme Deity—*after* Mind. The question is, how long after ? I do not refer to the duration of time needed, but to the steps or the stages that have to be passed. For between Mind and Deity, certainly between Mind and the Supreme Deity (Purushottama, as we would say), there may presumably still lie a course of graded emergence. In fact Sri Aurobindo speaks of the Overmind and the Supermind, as farther steps of the evolutionary progress coming after Mind. He says that Mind closes the inferior hemisphere of man's nature and consciousness ; with Overmind man enters into the higher sphere of the Spirit. In this view, the religious feeling or perception or conduct would be but an intermediary stage between Mind and Overmind. They are not really emergent properties, but reflections, faint echoes and promises of what is to come, mixed up with attributes of the present mentality. The Overmind brings in a true emergence.

Still Overmind—whose characteristic is a cosmic consciousness and a transcendence of all ego-sense—is not the firm basis on which a new terrestrial organisation can stand and endure. It is still a basis of unstable equilibrium. For it is not the supernal light and, although it transcends all ignorance, yet does not possess that absolute synthetic unity, that transcendent power of consciousness which is at once the cosmic and the individual. That is the domain of the Supermind.

The whole urge of evolutionary Nature today is to bring out first the Overmental principle and then through it the Supramental which will establish and fix upon earth the principle of Deity and the Supreme Divine.

NOLINI KANTA GUPTA

II.—THE PHILOSOPHIC MIND

"Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal." (I Cor. XIII. 1)

It has become almost a commonplace that the mind of man today is overpowered by a sense of confusion and futility in all things. And now on every side we hear ominous prophecies about "the crash of civilization" and "the extinction of the human race" whose effect is to a certain extent counteracted by such hope-kindling phrases as "A New World Order," "Federal Union," "Social Justice" and "The Rights of Man." While fortunately the popular prejudice against philosophy is not carried to the extent of calling the philosophers to account for the sorry state of things in which we find ourselves, it is largely agreed that they are not the persons to whom we should turn for guidance in our efforts to save Civilization from being swept off the face of this earth. If such a prejudice against philosophy exists I shall leave it to spend itself, merely remarking that it rests on the mistaken belief that to be a philosopher is to cut oneself off from what are termed "the practical issues" of life. But the most "practical-minded" among us cannot dispense with theories, even though he may call such theories "practical thinking." We cannot set about changing the world without interpreting it. And if it is believed that philosophy is the business of the solitary dweller in the "ivory tower" it will not be denied that thinking systematically and effectively is, or should be, every man's business.

Now philosophy to a large extent is thinking about thinking, or thinking becoming aware of itself. If sound thinking is necessary for reaching sane conclusions about practical affairs, an activity that examines the nature and the presuppositions of thinking, that tries to find out what it is that we do when we think, cannot conceivably be dismissed as something alien and unrelated to practical life. A great part of our thinking is done in collaboration with other minds through written and oral discussions. We must therefore know what collaborative thinking is and what it implies. Hence it is not too much to say that it is the business of everyone who thinks to understand what thinking is and it is the business of everyone who discusses to learn to distinguish a healthy and profitable discussion from a futile duel of words. The philosophic mind is thus, in one of its aspects, the self-conscious mind of thought or reasoning.

This process of becoming conscious of our minds in thinking is not introspection, a mere passive awareness of something that goes on in our minds. All understanding is

creative or, if you like, recreative. It is both a finding and a making. It transforms that which it understands. Thinking as so transformed or recreated through self-consciousness I shall call philosophic thinking, the epithet "philosophic" being applied to thinking when it functions in a certain way and not merely when it is directed to a certain kind of object. Philosophic thinking is really thinking liberated from its accidental limitations, working freely and naturally according to the laws of its own being.

Let us consider the process of thinking as it occurs in the ordinary affairs of life and more systematically in the various sciences. To think, we are told, is to judge, judgment being regarded as the unit of thought. But this does not give us an adequate idea of the nature of thinking, for it suggests that thinking consists in adding judgment to judgment, each judgment being regarded as a unit complete in itself. Thinking, however, is not a discrete but a continuous process and hence there can be no such thing as a *unit* of thought. A judgment taken in isolation from other judgments contains no thought whatever. It becomes a significant activity only if we take into account the occasion which called it forth, in other words, the context or background which it necessarily presupposes and from which it takes its rise. To cut it loose from its background, which is a system of judgments, in order to understand its significance in itself, is like trying to study the function of an amputated limb. Every statement that we make is really an answer to a question and hence its significance is determined by discovering the question to which it is meant to be an answer. The thought expressed in a judgment is never confined to the four corners of the judgment itself, but there is always more in or behind the judgment than meets the ear.

It is hence unfortunate that in our discussions we ignore the truth that in every statement that we make we present merely the surface of our minds, that we never mean only what we say and conversely that we never succeed in saying wholly what we mean. If this truth were generally recognized much misunderstanding and many futile controversies could be avoided. Communication between minds would become easier if we trained ourselves never to allow the face value of a statement to prejudice us against it and always probed into its underlying significance. Thinking therefore consists in drawing upon (in our own case) and probing into (in the case of another) what is to us a vast unconscious mind which is neither your mind nor mine, but ours; with it each of our minds is continuous and therefore our minds are continuous with each other.

We shall have a better insight into the philosophic mind in scientific thinking by contrasting it with the unphilosophic mode of thought. Unphilosophical thinking is not a

different species of thinking, but is thinking limited and circumscribed and in the long run made impotent. It is not a way of thinking but rather a way of refusing to think. Thought, to be free and fully self-possessed, should be fluidic, both penetrating and disarming, and non-partisan in spirit. Human thinking as we actually find it is too often inflexible, constantly on the defensive and corrupted by a spirit of partisanship. Partisan thinking is antithetical, antagonistic, in terms of conflicting opposites. It is thinking not in collaboration with but in opposition to other minds, thinking in terms of rigid "absolutes" for which opposition and discord are in the very life-blood of reasoning, and agreement and harmony merely its incidental and occasional results.

So long as the mind does not understand itself, does not think philosophically, it allows its ideas to harden into "pronounced" opinions, rounded and rigid "Schools" of thought and absolute "points of view." We are asked to "make a stand" on a definite issue, to come down on one or the other side of the fence, to swear by personalities and creeds, to "defend" our "position" against the attacks of others who are called our "opponents" and to "attack" their position in turn. Such thinking delights in the language of warfare, which in reality describes the working of the unphilosophic mind more literally than one would think. When a discussion becomes a dispute or a debate and the grace of conversation is lost in the heat of controversy there takes place a "battle of wits" and a duel of words, whose object is dialectical triumph rather than the discovery of truth. All disputation, it is said, betrays an enthusiasm for half-truths.

The great charm of the philosophic mind is that it is at once disarmed and disarming. The law of its being requires it to abjure violence and to be completely vulnerable in the process of thinking. It thinks to understand and to be understood. It has no position to "defend" against outside attacks, which means that it does not use the instrument of reason for setting up for itself and for defending a bubble reputation as a debater or a dialectician. The partisan mind is always armed and on the defensive. And since attack is the best form of defence, it is aggressive in thinking. It builds a defensive wall round itself by the use of *clichés*, expressions which suggest set reactions of thought, by obscure or technical language which serves to conceal rather than to reveal the thought within.

The method of probing into the mental background of our partner (not "opponent") in thinking may be accurately described as the historical way of dealing with problems. Just as a single thought has a mental background in which alone it gains significance, so a social phenomenon has its past history as its background into which we have to probe diligently to understand

and to appreciate the significance of the contemporary phenomenon. So to develop and to deepen the historical insight, which is also to deepen the sympathetically imaginative insight into human institutions, both alien and our own, is most requisite for those who have to deal with human situations and for those who assume the rôle of political leadership. History thus becomes a school of political and social wisdom.

But in order to use the historical insight for sane and profitable ends there must be a process of philosophic thinking which consists in the discovery and hence the recreation of ultimate values. This species of thinking provides the moral or spiritual foundation of all scientific thought. It is to this deeper and more comprehensive aspect of the philosophic mind that I shall lead my discussion as to a culminating point.

Spiritual thinking, which is a further deepening of self-consciousness, is the realization not merely of the mind in reasoning, but of the mind as a whole. It is an understanding that manifests itself not fragmentarily in mere theory but completely in action. It is the whole mind at work and therefore its action is as much living as thinking. To think comprehensively is to live fully and to love greatly.

The spiritual insight cannot be positively described except as an awareness of and therefore a freedom from the layer upon layer of defensive reactions with which we shut ourselves off from life. The moral law may be formulated thus:—Become completely vulnerable to life. We have to lose ourselves to find ourselves. Specific virtues are the form which our moral life exhibits, but we cannot take the insensate form of morality and create a spirit to dwell in it. The form itself is the expression of a spontaneous creation of the spirit. The action of the spiritual mind, which is the mind working as a whole, is pure action, action without passion, that is, action which is complete in itself and yet is completely unattached to its object, which is the same thing as freedom (*moksha*). And since the mind is completely disarmed it can harbour no desire for economic, moral or intellectual exploitation of its environment. It lives harmoniously and purposively, but with full recognition that there is no purpose in life beyond living. In the immortal words of Kant, it " treats humanity whether in its own person or in that of another always as an end and never as a means. "

I suppose the world today needs, as it has always needed, men of action and men of ideals, but more than these it needs men who are profound thinkers and lovers of humanity. Men of vision in whom, all passion spent, there is a sane understanding of the goods of life, political, social and economic, as necessarily subordinated to the ultimate good which they discover and live through in their own moral experience. Thus the true philos-

opher is not only a spectator of all time and existence, but also a citizen of the world in which he tries to embody his scheme of values in terms of rights and obligations in a just order of society, through example, through persuasion, through a system of education which liberates the mind from settled habits of thought; and all inspired by a feeling of profound love and respect for humanity. There is a wholeness about his vision, rational, historical and spiritual, in which all divisions of life and dualisms of thought enter and disappear. If he has no panacea to offer he does not escape from this world to live in a Utopia of his own. He himself sets up no claim to be a ruler of men or a shaper of their destinies. But those of us who are not complete philosophers, including myself, may well make that claim on behalf of those who are. I shall quote, with a slight modification, the well-known words from the Fifth Book of the *Republic* :—

"Until historians become philosophers and philosophers are made kings, or the kings and princes of this world have the spirit and power of philosophy and political greatness and wisdom meet in one, cities will never have rest from their evils—no, nor the human race—and then only will this our State have a possibility of life and behold the light of day."

J. N. CHUBB

WHAT ABOUT OLD CHARTS?

That the word *Weltanschauung* so often on Nazi tongues contains a challenge to Western civilization is pointed out in *The Times Literary Supplement* of 14th March in the review of a book, *The Path to Reconstruction*, on Albert Schweitzer's philosophy. The pertinent question is put :—

> What view of the world have those who hate the Hitlerian myth to set against it? The barrenness of the land is revealed as by lightning. Until Western civilization is able to provide a convincing alternative, its defenders will be fighting in the dark.

Is it the alternative that is lacking or the will to apply it? The clamour for bread is raised around full granaries. The accumulated wisdom of the ages is there to draw upon. To use a different simile, it is not the strategists or the diplomats or the bankers that can lead the peoples out of this desert of the spirit in which they are floundering, but men of clear vision, to find the charts buried under the sands of dogma and superstition, and of humility to follow the way out which those old charts show.

THE COMPANY OF MYSTICS

[Shri **J. Vijaya-Tunga's** article brings out plainly the confusion which exists in the public mind on the subject of Mysticism. Many follies have been committed in its name to its discrediting with those who take the imitation for the real. The *genuine* Mystic is the rare flower of humanity; he is one who *knows*; all other men opine.—Ed.]

Ideas can be manufactured as much as things. One goes into a shop and buys a thing without knowing the history of its invention. But at least a thing has a particular use, and one at least knows how to use it. Not so with ideas. They pass from mouth to mouth, become *clichés* and phrases and space-fillers on the tongue of some orator, and for all their use and purpose, they are as useless as Egyptian mummies.

Regard the term Mystic. How easy its use! And how current! But how few of those people who use it in their speech or writing know what they mean by it! Have they stopped to examine what Mysticism is exactly? Neither apparel nor demeanour bespeaks the mystic. If the only claim of Ramdas (1608-1681) to mysticism had been that he made himself scarce on his wedding-day it would be a poor claim, nay, a false claim. But by his subsequent career of spiritual striving and intellectual effort he earned the appellation of Mystic. For while there was nothing strikingly original about it, did he not arrive, by his own untutored thinking, at this definition of Cosmogony :—

When the earth is dry from the heat of the sun, God sends rain upon it to cool it off and the winter season results. When all animals become distressed because of the cold and the trees become withered, the summer season ensues. Living beings exist in orderly arrangement of time, which is divided into morning, noon and evening.

That last sentence is almost an echo from St. Thomas Aquinas :—

Nothing moves for the sake of moving, but only that it may reach some goal: all these movements must come to an end.

Neither the renunciation of carnal pleasures nor the continuous chanting of psalms makes for mysticism. These may or may not characterize a mystic. But above these characteristics (which become tricks in the hands of the cheat) there must be character, and a sublimation of the intellect, before one is entitled to that rare designation of Mystic.

As I understand it, there cannot be such a distinction as between minor and major Mysticism. Any state that falls short of Mysticism must be provided for under some other heading such as Sainthood, Enthusiasm, or Ecstasy. True, some of the European mystics were canonized.

Every age, every civilisation, has had its mystics, and no country or

period has had a monopoly of them. If we are familiar with certain names only it is because the record goes no further back or it has been lost. We might cast our eyes back to Jerusalem when Herod ruled and examine the teachings of Rabbi Hillel to see whether he was only a wise man who, by virtue of his wisdom, was elected Head of the Sanhedrim, or whether he was at the same time a mystic.

Hillel, householder and church executive though he was, was a mystic, the kind we should be recognizing more in our twentieth century if we had a clearer conception of what constitutes Mysticism. One can be dressed in a lounge suit and be clean-shaven, and yet be a mystic. A man like Eugene Debs, former unsuccessful candidate for the U. S. Presidency, deserves to be called a mystic. This is what he said at his trial on December 2nd, 1918 :—

Years ago I recognized my kinship with all living beings, and I made up my mind that I was not one bit better than the meanest of earth. I said then, and I say now, that while there is a criminal element I am of it, and while there is a soul in prison I am not free.

How very reminiscent of Chaitanya (1485-1533) who said :—

One should be humbler than a straw, more meek and patient than a tree, and without seeking honour for one's own self freely give it to others, and in humble spirit sing the praises of Krishna.

Being eloquent in a court of law, or being martyred, is not a sufficient qualification for mysticism. The rest of a man's life must fit into the pattern before his fellow-men could call him a mystic.

Mention of Shri Chaitanya brings to mind Mme. Guyon (1648-1717) one of the famous Quietists. Chaitanya's inspiration was Krishna, while Mme. Guyon's was Christ. By upbringing and tradition the two were worlds apart. And yet what striking similarity there is in the two passages which follow !

On seeing the Jagannath Temple at Puri Chaitanya was so overcome by emotion that he kept on crying "*Jag, Jag, Jag,*" until he fell down in a faint. On regaining consciousness he burst into song :—

I remember the day when we loved each other on the banks of the Reva. Today the sweet breeze blows. The Malati blooms around and the Kadamba flower, drenched with dew, sends its fragrance, and you, my beloved, are present before me here, and so am I before you, the same that I ever was. But yet does my heart long for a union with you in the shades of the cane bowers on the banks of the Reva.

And Mme. Guyon, convent-closeted, following her own visions, uttered these words :—

After Thou hast wounded me so deeply, Thou didst begin, Oh my God, to withdraw Thyself from me : and the pain of Thy absence was the more bitter to me because Thy presence was so sweet to me.

The leader of the Quietists was Molinos about whom Bishop Burnett,

writing from Italy in 1685, reported as follows :—

The new method of Molinos doth so much prevail at Naples, that it is believed he hath above twenty thousand followers in the city. He hath writ a book which is entitled *Il Guida Spirituale* which is a short abstract of the mystical divinity ; the substance of the whole is reduced to this, that in our prayers and other devotions the best methods are to retire the mind from all gross images, and so to form an act of faith and thereby to present ourselves before God, and then to sink into a silence, and cessation of new acts, and to let God act and to follow His conduct.

Quietists, Allombrados, Illuminati (in Andalusia), Illuminés (in Picardy)—there were many such inspired bands of devotees in France and in Spain in the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries, and Papal Rome had good reason for fearing them. For *the Mystic, believing in universal truths, cannot be bigoted, and caste, colour, race, religion—none of these stand between him and a single one of God's creatures.*

A Church Father who was influenced by the French mystics was Fénelon (1651-1715). Here is what Fénelon has to say " On Abandon or Self-Abnegation " :—

Holy indifference, which is nought else than the disinterestedness of love, becometh under the severest trials that which the holy mystics have called *abandon*, meaning that the disinterested soul doth wholly and without reserve abandon itself to God for all which concerneth its own interest ; yet never doth it renounce either love or any other thing which toucheth the glory and good pleasure of its Beloved. This *abandon* is but the self-abnegation or self-renunciation which in the Gospel Jesus Christ requireth of us after that we have left all for His sake.

And here we have Aurobindo Ghose in our own time explaining the yoga of the *Bhagavat Gita :—*

The Will must not be made to work through *Prana*, through *Chitta*, through *Manas*, as if you were physically wrestling with the thing you want to control... trying to dominate the subject by thought, by thinking, " Let this be. Let this happen. "

And he adds :—

Your surrender must be self-made and free, it must be the surrender of a living being, not of an inert automaton or mechanical tool.

All too well do we know what a tyrant the body is and how unending its demands on our time, so that a mystic like Edward Carpenter was right in emphasising that the dog must follow the master and not the master the dog. That is to say, the Mind must give the orders and the Body obey them. But this is advice that can be distorted at the hands of penance-loving *sadhus* and *fakirs* (though mention of these must not confuse the subject under discussion, which is Mysticism), so that it is as well to bear in mind what the Spanish Teresa de Jesus (1515-1582) has to say. She summed up her life well when she said that she had spent it engaged " in that strife and contention which arose out of my

attempts to reconcile God and the world." Her advice was: "Take care of the body for the love of God." That is to say, look after it well so that it functions efficiently, so that it is a pleasant spectacle to your fellow-men, and not a gross, fat-laden, disease-ridden thing. It does not mean, pander to its ape-wants, or concentrate upon it so much that myself-all-the-time and devil-take-the-other-fellow becomes one's dominating rule of life. Teresa de Jesus adds:—

Even if you are in the kitchen our Lord moves amidst the pots and the pans, helping us both within and without.

A forerunner of Teresa de Jesus was Catarina Adorno of Genoa (1447-1510). Teresa and Catarina are examples of Communicative Mysticism, while Mme. Guyon, Chaitanya, Blake and Walt Whitman typify Inspired Mysticism. Many of the Persian mystics were "inspired," though I would place Hafiz and Jami, and the more recent Baha, as exponents of Communicative Mysticism. Ramakrishna, the Bengali, was a Contemplative Mystic, notwithstanding his frequent ecstasies, and he reminds one of the Psalmist's words: "*Quoniam non cognovi litteraturam, introibo in potentias Domini.*" (Because I have not known learning I will enter into the powers of the Lord.)

Leibnitz, like Fénelon, belonged to that order who are on the fringe of Mysticism, who have great understanding of the mystic's nature, and who become commentators and torch-bearers.

It is not everyone who can aspire to the seldom-attainable peaks of Mysticism; for most of us they must serve as examples, if not for emulation, at least for admiration.

The Company of Mystics is a large one; but not so large as to be too formidable for our understanding of their simple lives and of their equally simple teachings. I could do no better than to quote this simple explanation of mysticism as Lafcadio Hearn has given it:—

When you make religion love, without ceasing to be religious, and make love religion, without ceasing to be human and sensuous, in the good sense of the word, then you have made a form of mysticism.

J. VIJAYA-TUNGA

JESUS CHRIST

GLIMPSES OF HIS LIFE AND MISSION

[This is the eighth and last of the series by **Ernest V. Hayes** which presents the Prophet of Nazareth as an Adept of the Good Law.—Ed.]

VIII.—IMMORTALITY

In considering the stories told of Jesus after his physical death, we shall not be able to claim any part of these narratives as "historic" until science and thought widen out to include the unseen as well as the seen. That day will come, slowly, but with more strength because of its cautious approach. The occult student may leap forward, urged and guided, not only by his own quickened inner perceptions, but by accredited occult teaching given by reliable teachers. The ordinary man will move with hesitancy, expecting a lead from religion or from science. The Religion of the future and the Science of the future will give that lead, with a sense of great responsibility and a score of qualifying clauses to every admission made in favour of the hidden side of life. On that laboriously firm foundation the ordinary man of the future—not quite so ordinary as the man of today—will accept new interpretations of psychology, history, faith, purpose and his own destiny.

In dealing with the series of incidents grouped by orthodoxy around the Resurrection, we ought first to consider what was the view of immortality held by the people to whom Jesus mainly addressed his message. According to the New Testament, the Pharisees—most influential of the sects among the Jewish people—accepted the idea of "Resurrection," while the Sadducees—another influential party—denied it. The Jewish historian, Josephus, himself a strict Pharisee, tells us that the Pharisees believed in a rather peculiar form of Reincarnation. They considered that the wicked were annihilated after death. Possibly this meant that in the life of the evil man there was nothing that had even a relative permanence about it. For Good alone is of the eternal: Evil is a self-destroying agency, an "everlasting fire" of wasting. Those who had lived good lives, without reaching perfection, came back in other bodies, until perfection was gained. Judging by the world as we know it, one might be tempted to think the exact opposite to be the case; the wicked come back too often and the good find their expression in a happier sphere. But if the Pharisees had an esoteric side to their teaching—as is probable—by annihilation they may have meant that so much of the individuality of the wicked man was

wasted by evil that though there might be a continuity of life between a man who had lived in the days of Moses—let us say—and a man living in the time of Jesus, yet there was no true sense of individualised immortality linking the two lives together. In the case of the good man, the richness of his individuality would pass from life to life, so forming a true Ego incarnating in body after body. It will, at least, be clear that the "Resurrection" accepted by the Pharisees and rejected by the Sadducees, according to the New Testament, was a form of the Reincarnation theory, and not Resurrection as understood in the orthodox Christian creeds.

It would seem that Jesus held a similar view-point with regard to the idea of personal immortality. It is likely that he felt very deeply that until a man experiences what immortality is, within his own consciousness, it is only possible to speak of it in a vague and somewhat unsatisfactory way. One fancies that to any one who complained of the indefinite and uncertain manner with which the Prophets of the race had dealt with the Soul, Jesus would have replied: "How, beyond merely arousing a man's attention, can you hope, by discussion and controversy, to prove an immortality which does not in fact exist for the individual until he has won it, and knows within his own soul that the prize is his?" Up to that point he would be along the line of the Buddha, whose reticence about the soul has led some of his followers to deny the soul altogether. But Jesus was a Yogi of Action; a Yogi of Love, more than he was a Yogi of Wisdom. His love for man and his eagerness to prove, if at all possible, the certainty of immortality, that so his disciples might be fortified and led on to their own achievement, would be the motives for what is said to have happened after his physical death.

To his sorrowing disciples, his end must have seemed at first an overwhelming tragedy, a hopeless finality. They looked at his battered body, and it seemed to them that the loved voice could never speak again and that the eyes, lit by a radiance beyond all human reckoning, would never smile again. This was Death. He himself had spoken of death as an incident that did not matter very much. But they, seeing his death, must have felt that it mattered a great deal.

They buried him in a disciple's garden. A day passed. Nothing happened. The best they could hope was that they might be allowed to disperse quietly to their homes, without molestation.

In the dawn of the next day women went to the grave of Jesus. They found the grave empty. There was no body. Body! Flesh! Matter! How the human mind clings to it and can hardly believe in any reality apart from it! Even Mary Magdalene was caught in it and said: "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him."

But all that had been taken—or dissolved by occult power—was a dead body. Her "Lord" was quite unaffected. Had he not said: "The flesh profiteth nothing; the spirit giveth life?"

There was no body of Jesus in the grave. Of all questions asked in futility, the question of what became of it is the most futile. One may ask such a questioner: What has become of *your* body which you were wearing five to seven years ago? The alchemy of Nature has completely transformed your material envelope within that space of time. You agree? Very well. There is a swifter alchemy known to Occultists, of materialising and dematerialising, practised quite easily by Adepts.

There was no body and the women's precious spices seemed likely to be wasted. But there was a radiant Being—a Shining One. The Angel asked them: "Why seek ye the Living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen."

Mary Magdalene lingered. She wept, bewildered. Her Master was in God's other world; she felt sure of that. But she wanted him here, the old loved voice, the gentle hand, the winning personality. Something darkened her path. She looked up. In the half-light of the early morning she was able faintly to discern a man. His face was not very clear and his voice none too strong. He was the Adept materialising himself for her sake. The voice gathered its old strength and nuances: "Mary!" Then she recognised him.

That same day, at evening, the disciples were gathered, "*the doors being shut.*" The closed and solid doors could hold out a physical body but they could not offer resistance to the entry of a Master clad in a superphysical vehicle of consciousness. Jesus stood in their midst. His astral body, perfect replica of the physical now forever laid aside, seemed as real and tangible to them as though it were physical. Their power of response had been raised to a higher plane. Not a plane of life and form but seems totally real, firm and unchallengeable to the one raised to the level of that plane.

Historically, Jesus is dead. Occultly, "he holdeth life and death in his strong hand." "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and behold, I am alive forevermore." That was the greatest service he rendered to his disciples; he proved to them the utter fallacy of the supposed power of Death. In his teaching he had linked himself onto the little the Hebrew Scriptures had to say about Immortality..." though this my body be destroyed, yet without my flesh I shall see God." He had said to them: "Fear not them that can destroy the body." He had spoken of the unseen and the intangible with a strong sense of their reality in his own consciousness. But all that was philosophy, and the souls of the disciples swayed, half-believing, half-hoping, half-doubting. He utilised the death of his own body to prove to them beyond all

doubt that death meant very little, that " never the Spirit was born ; the Spirit can cease to be, never." He could only prove it to his chosen, for to prove Immortality to the man who is not ready for it is really a disservice to him. But his Initiates knew it, whatever else they had still to learn ; for they had seen him, so real that he seemed as flesh and blood to them, yet so infinitely greater than the finest flesh can ever be. " If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." It was not the martyrdom but the triumph over death that made the Faith.

What of today? Around us is the decay of Faith. The decay of faith in the orthodox sense is to be welcomed. The loss of Faith in the sense Jesus understood it is to be deplored. We stagger on, sceptical, exhausted, feverish, futile, frustrated. But what happened in the days of Shri Krishna, of Buddha and of Jesus can happen how. Only we are so clever ; so heavily burdened ; we have " great possessions." And Their Way demands complete nakedness.

ERNEST V. HAYES

COMMUNALISM

State aid to communal institutions is an affront to common justice as well as to the tax-payer and the Editor of the *Indian Social Reformer* is right, in his issue of the 27th of June, in seeing efforts for the withdrawal of such aid, along with agitation against distinctions in eating-houses, as the starting-point for wiping out communalism. It goes without saying that no sectarian religious body should receive State support in a land of many religions. It is quite understandable that a Government contributing to the support of a church of one denomination might find it embarrassing to deny assistance to, say, educational institutions under the ægis of other creeds. But we would go so far as to maintain that every educational institution should open its doors to all or fend for itself without State subsidy. And that includes not only institutions under the auspices of Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs but also such Christian missionary institutions as make any distinctions whatsoever between Christian and non-Christian pupils or between Indian children on the one hand and European and Indo-Anglian children on the other. Such institutions are hotbeds of communal prejudice.

Shri S. Natarajan pleads for a movement to wipe out communalism in place of sporadic agitation such as that aroused in Bombay by Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel's opening of the Mafatlal swimming pool for Hindus only. Such a plea has been made more than once in our pages, beginning with Shri Manu Subedar's appeal for an Anti-Communal League in January 1940.

Shri Natarajan castigates the separate Hindu and Muslim tea stalls on Government-owned railways. Demand for such separation there may be but pandering to a weakness is no true kindness to the individual or to society. How great the need is for the recognition of the the simple fact that we are first and foremost human souls and only after that men or women, brown or white, Hindu or Muslim, Jain or Jew, and all the rest of the superficial distinctions in the physical or mental garb we wear!

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

"BE NOT ANXIOUS...." *

Fear, it is generally admitted, if not the root of all evil, is one of the chief of evils. It strikes deeper than greed, deeper than the lust for power. It dictates the logic by which man rationalises his cruelty and it lurks unsatisfied and unappeased behind all those formidable defences he builds to assure himself he is secure. Man is always building Maginot Lines or negotiating Munich settlements or setting out to conquer the world because fear torments him. Or he is accumulating wealth by exploiting his neighbour or rejecting with violence a truth which might weaken his false assurance or clinging to the old clothes of habit because love would expose his nakedness.

There are a thousand insidious ways in which fear poisons the well of life within us, brutalising even our courage, transforming virtue into self-righteousness, passion into jealousy, or modesty into a shrinking recoil. So universal an impulse cannot be without warrant in the nature of things and, like all impulses which have become perverted, it must in its original purity have served the needs of life and may equally serve the needs of man, if it ceases to be a negation and becomes a positive. It can only become that when man understands his nature better and acts upon his understanding.

Typical of the lack of such understanding is the failure to distinguish, as the writer of a recent autobiography, Mr. William Bowyer, did in his *Brought Out in Evidence*, between fear as it manifests in the animal and the human worlds. Mr. Bowyer, who takes a dark view of life and is convinced that high heaven and earth ail from their prime foundation, cites the unceasing alertness of birds as proof of the internecine terror under which all creation groans.

Yet any one who has studied the habits of birds or of many animals knows that fear in them seldom affects their capacity for happiness, while at times even seeming to heighten it, if I am to judge by the blackbird which pursues with shrill abuse my cat as he slinks through the shrubbery. Fear helps an animal to preserve its life. It neither torments him into destroying more life than he needs for food nor lays on him a continual burden of anxiety. A bird fears neither life nor death but lives in both and accepts both from moment to moment. And if we may think that some animals, such as the bullock driven to the slaughterhouse, fear death before it falls on them, it is probably because of their association with man, whose conscious purpose at such moments they dimly sense. It would, of course, be foolish to suggest that wild creatures are not at times paralysed by fear. Victims of the stoat or the snake prove the contrary. In the struggle for life in the animal world fear plays an in-

* *The Nature and Destiny of Man.* By Reinhold Niebuhr. (Nisbet and Co. Ltd., London. 15s.)

cessant part and often a grim one. But it is never a disease, as in the human world. It has become a disease there because man is a self-conscious being capable of isolating himself in different degrees from the whole life-process of which he is a part. That is a truism and not in itself a very helpful one. Yet examined more closely it can open the way to a freedom commensurate with the burden which man alone has to carry.

Such an examination Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr has made in the first volume of his Gifford Lectures, entitled *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, and it is based on the truth that man is the only animal which can make itself its own object. He alone has a capacity for self-transcendence and from this springs all the trouble. For standing at the juncture of nature and spirit he is involved in both freedom and necessity. As part of nature he is finite. As spirit he is infinite. And this unresolved contradiction provokes in him a continual anxiety. To ease this anxiety he is driven in two directions. In one he seeks in his pride to hide his mortality, to overcome his insecurity by his own power and to establish his independence. This effort may take a mental or a material form. If the former, he assumes he can transcend the limits of finite thought until his mind becomes identical with universal mind. This is the ideological taint in all human knowledge and which is always an effort to hide ignorance by pretension. If the latter, he strives to protect himself against nature's contingencies by seeking an absolute security for himself at the expense of his fellowmen.

But he may move in the opposite direction. Instead of seeking to hide his finiteness by asserting the boundless independence of spirit, he may strive to hide his freedom, and relieve the strain of maintaining it, by losing himself in some aspect of the world's or nature's vitalities. In the one case his sin is pride, in the other sensuality. But both spring from the same root and Dr. Niebuhr rightly insists that sensuality

> is never the mere expression of natural impulse in man. It always betrays some aspect of his abortive effort to solve the problem of finiteness and freedom. Human passions are always characterised by unlimited and dæmonic potencies of which animal life is innocent.

This is what distinguishes the purely natural will-to-live from the human and spiritual will-to-power. And the boundless character of human ambitions or desires is the consequence of man's effort to hide his weakness, to deny his dependence and insignificance and thus to quiet his fears. Yet mortality and dependence are not of themselves evil but become the occasion of evil when man refuses to accept them as a condition of overcoming them. Similarly anxiety is the basis of all human creativity as well as the pre-condition of sin. Man, as Dr. Niebuhr writes,

> is anxious not only because his life is limited and dependent, but because he doesn't know the limits of his possibilities. He can do nothing and regard it perfectly done, because higher possibilities are revealed in each achievement. There is, therefore, no limit of achievement in any sphere of activity in which human history can rest with equanimity.

Anxiety about perfection and anxiety about insecurity are inexorably bound together in human actions, and man's ambition to be something

> is always partly prompted by the fear

of meaninglessness which threatens him by reason of the contingent character of his existence. His creativity is therefore always corrupted by some effort to overcome contingency by raising precisely what is contingent to absolute and unlimited dimensions.

" Oh, wretched man," one is inclined to say after reading many pages of Dr. Niebuhr's searching analysis, " how pitiable is thy dilemma ! Thou, whose heaven-born aspirations are the spur that goads thee to outrage thy humanity in the anguish of thy homelessness." Yet it is just this apparently insoluble dilemma which gives to man his tragic greatness. And the shallowness of the bourgeois culture and the commercial civilisation which are now dying of spiritual emptiness was due to an attempted evasion of it. The typical modern man tried to live either by reason or by nature. The rationalist depreciated the power and virtue of sub-rational vitalities ; the romanticist glorified them. But neither understood that man is free enough to violate both the necessities of nature and the logical systems of reason and that the human spirit in its yearning towards the infinite cannot be held within the bounds of either natural necessity or rational prudence.

The very insatiability of human desire, has a positive significance: it means this, that we are attracted by an infinite good.

In that lies the source of both human creativity and human sin. And if under the perpetual smile of modernity there is or was " a grimace of disillusion and cynicism, " it was because man had ceased to measure himself in a dimension high or deep enough to do justice either to his stature or to his capacity for both good and evil. The tragic challenge of human existence had been reasoned away, its vital paradox cut at one end by mechanism, at the other by sensationalism. But it was there all the time. And today we are being forced to recognise it.

But, recognising it, what are we to do ? If the contradiction is part and parcel of human existence, how can it ever be resolved ? Can faith ever become stronger than fear in man so that it no longer torments him into pride and sensuality, but inspires him to create ? Never wholly, Dr. Niebuhr believes, because man is a fallen being and however near he may approach to divine perfection, he must always fall short of it. To claim that he can achieve absolute perfection is to betray the very sin of spiritual pride which for ever, in subtle no less than in crude forms, forbids perfection.

But because it is not man's finiteness, dependence and weakness, but his anxiety about them which tempts him to sin, he is ideally free to reduce this anxiety in himself and so redeem the conflict in which he is involved by accepting his dependence. But upon what ? If he merely accepts his status as a natural creature, he is denying his freedom as transcendent spirit. But if he asserts his freedom as spirit, he is continually tempted to flout his natural limitations. Unless there is some mystery at the heart of things and of himself in which nature and spirit are reconciled and in which he can find his home, he is at best doomed to oscillate for ever between fearful defiance and miserable abjectness.

The fact of self-transcendence in man leads inevitably, therefore, as Dr. Niebuhr argues, to the search for a God who transcends the world. Or, to quote Augustine's familiar words, " Thou madest us for thyself, and our

heart is unquiet till it rest in thee." Elsewhere, however, Augustine wrote, " I am of the opinion that the creature will never become equal with God, even when so perfect a holiness is accomplished within us as that it shall be quite incapable of receiving an addition." And Dr. Niebuhr believes that only in Christian doctrine are the relevance and distance between the human and the divine truly preserved. This is on a par with his repeated assertion that mysticism must lead to a loss of the particular, in an ultimate undifferentiated reality and that consequently all mystics view individuality as essentially evil. Such mysticism is in fact to be found in both Christians and non-Christians. But the true mysticism which combines liberation from the transitory in the eternal with fidelity to the eternal in the temporal is certainly not the monopoly of the Christian religion. At most Christianity, through its doctrine of the incarnation, has laid a special stress on the concrete historical expression of the divine, but often at the cost of temporal prejudice. The fault in some other religions has tended to be the other way.

On the whole, however, any prejudice which Dr. Niebuhr betrays in favour of his own Faith does little damage to his interpretation of human nature and its relation to the divine. We can agree with him that the God in whom man's unquiet heart can alone find rest both creates and transcends the world. He is, therefore, in but not of the finite world on which man must acknowledge his dependence, and He is the eternal source of man's infinite spirit. In Him the contradiction of man's dual being is resolved and the more closely man can find Him in the depths of his experience and finding love, and loving find, the more is fear swallowed up in faith, its tormenting tensions eased in the inward harmony of the Soul with itself, in a pure willing of that which is divinely willed. The nearer a man comes to that pure willing, the less has the divine Being in which he knows and breathes and acts any outward form, still less any arbitrary gender. The last taint of the partial assumptions of anthropomorphism fades away. And it is through the mystery of the formless eternal One that he values all the forms of nature and precious individualities which no longer bind him falsely because he loves them both in Time and beyond it. In the depth and serenity of that experience, if we could attain to it, we would fear no more but rejoice in our double birthright as spirit and flesh, and do violence to neither.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

WOMEN IN AMERICA *

The author discusses the secular problem of the right and the rightful place of women in organised society. On her return to the United States from China, Pearl Buck found that her sisters were unhappy and discontented, and she asked herself:—

> Why, in a country such as ours, where woman is given every privilege and as much opportunity apparently as she wants, should she be so often dissatisfied in herself and so restless an influence in society? And why should man not like her better that he does?

She starts from this position:—

> The basic discovery about any people is the discovery of the relationship between its men and women....Where there is harmony between men and women the culture of a country—that is, its whole life—is full, peaceful, and without nervous tensions, and progress is steady and rounded.

For "men cannot be free in a nation where women are forbidden freedom," and "always suffer where women are ignorant." Can this harmony and freedom be realised "in a patterned society such as old China had, and in another sense as modern Germany has today?" The answer is decidedly in the negative, though the author has a kind word to say of old China. Caged and thwarted women upset the balance of social economy and stand in the way of man's own advancement.

One would expect in the United States, where women are supposed to enjoy political and social equality with men, conditions to be such as to promote harmony and progress. The author devotes the greater part of the book to showing that the freedom of her sisters is an illusion. "The half-and-half sort of things we now have, patently gives satisfaction to neither men nor women." Women have no place "in the engine-rooms of our society," although numbers of them have "great good sense, quiet competence, and plain wisdom." The home no longer offers sufficient scope for their talents. "Industrial development has taken man out of the home," and "even the child has been taken from her by the change of time....He leaves the home at the age of six or earlier, compulsorily, and from then on is returned to woman only for a few of his waking hours....The home...is a lonely place." More; "she is no longer the spiritual and moral influence she was once to man and child in the home." Women have to accept the position that they are married to "perpetually tired men," and the husband was probably representative of a large group, who told the author, "I do not want a damned intelligent woman in the house when I come home at night. I want my mind to rest."

Are American women then to accept the situation and reconcile themselves to it? Not at all, for "no country is a true democracy whose women have not an equal share in life with men," and no country can afford to educate her women as the United States does, and then deny them equal opportunities with men for service and self-realisation. This frustration of the greater number of American women constitutes not only a national loss but a national danger. The author speaks of these millions of women, "who are not compelled to earn money to keep from starvation,...who have surplus time, energy, and ability, which they

* *Of Men and Women.* By PEARL S. BUCK. (The John Day Co., New York. $2.00)

do not know how to use...[who] have usually a fair or even an excellent education and brains good enough at least to be aware of discontent," as the "gunpowder women" of the country. "These gunpowder women... spoilt, petty, restless, idle, they are our nation's greatest unused resource."

What is the way out?

> There is no way of progress for women except the way men have gone—the way of work or starve, work or be disgraced....Work is the one supreme privilege which too many women in America, with all their extraordinary unearned privileges, never know. And yet it is the one privilege which will really make them free.

There is one field of human relations where woman can do much, if not everything, to help man out of the morass in which he has landed himself.

> If man, conditioned to war, cannot provide a society which sees war at its beginnings and stifles it, can woman not try at least to help him here? Is she for ever to go blindly giving birth to sons that men may go blindly killing them off?

The author points out that two of the main causes of war are economic discontent, and the rise to power of a certain type of mind, "atavistic, cruel, simple, or cunning." The rise to power of the atavistic individual must be prevented, and economic adjustments made in a nation and between nations. It lies with women to deal with these sources of international conflicts, as they, unlike men, "have no illusions, or should have none, about what war is." "It would be a great task, and would give women ample work to do.

Man may doubt woman's capacity, but why does woman herself hesitate to play her right part in the great human drama? "She has been afraid of losing her femininity," but the truth is that

> if a woman is a real woman and proud to be one, nothing can quench the essential femininity of her being....No kind of work can spoil the quality of a woman unless she has first spoiled it herself by wishing consciously or unconsciously that she were not a woman.

This in brief represents the message of the book, and no message could be more appropriate at a time when we are all talking of constructing a new world order of equality and peace, nor come with greater authority than from the accomplished woman of letters who, by her work, has raised the stature of women and lent distinction to the Nobel Prize.

N. S. SUBBA RAO

A NEW KIND OF MAN *

Whitman is an exceptionally difficult subject to get right. For he is not a straight case. So many questions arise—the democrat, the poet, the prophet, the seer, the philosopher—was he all of these things or any of them? I have been pondering these questions for a long time after reading Mr. Fausset's wonderfully full and acute analysis. I think he helps the reader to arrive at the following conclusions. Whitman was a new kind of man, the fulfilment of a New Idea evolved by mankind—a democrat. He was the first to embody that idea completely and he may have been the last, but

* *Walt Whitman*. By HUGH I'ANSON FAUSSET. (Jonathan Cape, Ltd., London. 12*s*. 6*d*.)

that is what he was. To have been that, to have shown what a democrat is, cannot be described as an achievement, he did not have to achieve it, but rather as a revelation never to be forgotten. He did not light a lamp. He did not pave a path. He merely was something which we contemplate with the reverence we reserve for the saviours and the gods. People ask what the snag is about democracy and whether we can detect it in the champion of democracy. Certainly not. The only snag is that all men are not on the Whitman level. That is the only reason why democracy, like everything else, fails.

Was Whitman a poet? Of course. Was he a good poet? No, he was second-rate. He found it extremely hard to express himself, and though occasionally his *Leaves* are really great, more often they only get across owing to the sheer *élan* behind them—yet so powerful is that *élan* that even when he gives us capitulation in place of description, he makes his point. But that's not poetry. He mistook art for artificiality, and was afraid that if he took real trouble he would be paralysed. Nevertheless if *Leaves of Grass* is seldom great literature it is a great book, one of the greatest. The force of Affirmation so pervades it that it has often been found sufficient to change a reader's view of life for ever. It can best be regarded as Scripture.

Was he a prophet? He professed to be, both as seer and as prophet of America. In the second he is now seen to have been a hopeless optimist without a notion of the effect which machines and money were to have upon his country. As regards his claim to be a seer with a message, it is true he had a message and a good one, but since he couldn't think clearly, since he was arrogantly ignorant of better minds than his own, since he just doesn't exist as a thinker or philosopher, he only made a muddle of his message.

Was he a true mystic? Here we come to the central problem concerning him. He claimed, in effect, to have reached the third stage of consciousness without having to pass through the valley of the shadow of the second. Mr. Fausset of course faces up to this aspect and writes as follows—

> Admittedly the acute conflict from which, in much of the religious experience of the past, unity has had to be resolved may not be a permanent condition of human growth. A race of men may emerge more spiritually advanced and able to unfold its powers organically. Whitman, it has been suggested, was a precursor of such men as these. And certainly there is much in him and in his teaching which throws light on the qualities which such men would possess. But there is much, also, to show that the integrity which he professed was partial and that it was the result rather of arrested than of an advanced development.

Mr. Fausset may be right, but he left this reader with a mind still quite uncertain about it. If Whitman had not written himself up into a System and confused us, we might possibly allow him that special newness. In the same way he was right but overemphatic (owing to the appalling Puritanism he set out to destroy) about the visible world and the flesh. It had been thought that there was something *low* about matter and something *high* about spirit—though, as Carpenter once said, "we haven't the least idea what matter *is*." Whitman tried to destroy that absurdity, and it is rather his means than his end that we sometimes question.

Mr. Fausset has added another volume to his already solid and splendidly unified achievement. This book is (we must use the word) definitive. Why another on Whitman after this? It is masterly. Mr. Fausset is a master in his power to enclose the whole of his

subject, the mental, the physical, and the life story—in these pages Whitman lives vividly in a fine chapter on his work in the hospitals. Mr. Fausset is conventional on matters outside his own field (One wonders what the R. A. F. would think of his remarks about modern fighting) but inside it he has it all his own way. He makes his point in bulk, never by a telling sentence, and often we have to put up with smug and dreadful phrasing such as "to achieve maturity man needs to outgrow his infantile dependence upon Nature, to affirm his own true centre of conscious being and rediscover Nature there as creator instead of creature. This, as we have shown, Whitman had succeeded very imperfectly in doing." But he makes one memorable remark. He says that the voice of the *Leaves* "was a voice that set out to silence all other voices." That's just it. It sums up Whitman's strength and weakness.

JOHN STEWART COLLIS

An Introduction to the Philosophy of Sri Aurobindo. By S. K. MAITRA. (The Culture Publishers, 25A, Bakulbagan Row, Calcutta. Re. 1/8)

Thousands of years have passed since the spiritual seers of ancient India gave to the world the transcendent truths enshrined in the Indian scriptures, but the genius of the race is still seen at its metaphysical best and subtlest in ontological flights. The acknowledgment by Sri Aurobindo's interpreter of his indebtedness to the ancients, is, however, at once inadequate and too sweeping—inadequate in that originality is claimed for concepts which are certainly as old as thinking man, *e.g.*, "that it is possible for man in this terrestrial life, in this physical body, to attain complete Divinity," and that salvation does not demand withdrawal from the world and is not a purely individual achievement; too sweeping in claiming "complete accord" with the spirit of the *Vedas* and the *Upanishads*. His mind plays like a lambent flame over many of their teachings; it does not throw a steady light on all. Sometimes indeed a statement of his, such as that "we do not live in an ethical world" not only negatives their teachings but also undermines his own. For if, as he claims, "the attempt of human thought to force an ethical meaning into the whole of Nature" is an act of "wilful and obstinate self-confusion," if the law of harmony, of action and reaction, of Karma, in other words, does not govern universally, on what does his triple evolution rest, on what, the gradual unfoldment through many lives on earth which he describes? For surely a certain, a dependable reaction is of the very essence of ethics.

Is it perhaps the inadequate grasp of the part of rhythm in the process—although he does refer to it—that makes death seem to him "not an inherent characteristic of life" but something to be transcended "when Life is freed from the operation of Mind, as it will be on the descent of the Supermind." *Life* is not subject to death even now, but surely the same form cannot forever serve even the Supermind!

The most valuable contributions of the book are its insistence on the necessity of finding the inner being as the first step for the aspirant, and its inspiring presentation of the ideal of "a transformation of the whole being through the light emanating from the soul," the loss of our heavy sense of separateness without the relinquishing of individual consciousness. Sri Aurobindo's description of the state of one who has attained, whom he calls the "supramental" or the "gnostic" being, illuminates a phrase so often quoted but so little understood—"acting for and as the Self of all creatures."

E. M. H.

Darkness and The Light. By OLAF STAPLEDON. (Methuen and Co. Ltd., London. *7s. 6d.*)

A revealing indication of the climax in human affairs is given by the fact that the word, fantastic, has invaded everyday speech to such an extent that it no longer has impact. Anything and everything has become a possibility, consequently any theory—no matter how grotesque by former standards—cannot be dismissed with contempt.

Realisation of the probability that everything once grouped under the spacious heading of "normal" may have vanished for ever, has compelled people to scan dim horizons in the hope, or fear, of discerning the shadow of approaching destiny.

With the exception of those who believe that a miracle will restore something resembling the Victorian age, the majority are compelled to think that either the catastrophic triumph of gangster values is inevitable, and that to hope otherwise is to dream that you can "weep Fate from its determined purpose": or, as a result of ordeal by suffering, a new spirituality will be born in the catacombs of despair and mankind be regenerated.

The theme of Mr. Olaf Stapledon's book is apposite to these fears and hopes, for, in the first two parts of *Darkness and The Light,* he traces, stage by stage, the process of degeneration till, long after an epic but unsuccessful defence of The Light by the Tibetans, rats, plagues and pests exterminate mankind.

The opening of Part III returns to the defence of The Light by the Tibetans and assumes that it succeeded. "It was in Tibet that hope first triumphed, and it was Tibet's miraculous success that inspired the rest of the world." Big-scale war developed against the Tibetans but the victory of the latter was such that even their enemies were compelled to realise that this war "had opened a new and hopeful chapter in the history of man." New wars followed, however, but the spark survives till new processes transform the whole economy of the world. At last, at long last, the main centre of civilisation is the new island of Atlantis which produces a new human type, the "secondary," who are loyal to The Light, while the "primary" population dwindles to extinction.

Space considerations preclude an adequate account of the manner in which Mr. Stapledon orchestrates this theme. His reputation for "fantasy" will be enhanced by this book although, for one reader, "Odd John" is not dethroned. It is, perhaps, inevitable that any treatment of such a theme must suggest a "scenario" for a whole library of books. It is, perhaps, also inevitable that this attempt to reveal the "dual" possibilities of the future must have a somewhat arbitrary air. Also, events happen, not in a theoretic void, but to people. One reader kept wishing that Mr. Stapledon had written a novel depicting each stage in the descent to Darkness, and a novel depicting each stage in the ascent to The Light. And that, in itself, is a unique tribute to Mr. Stapledon's ambitious and courageous book.

CLAUDE HOUGHTON

The World's Crisis and Faiths. By BARON ERIK PALMSTIERNA. John Lane, The Bodley Head, London. 8*s.* 6*d.*)

The Christian Paradox. By CYRIL SCOTT. (Rider and Co. Ltd., London. 8*s.* 6*d.*)

The Occult Causes of the Present War. By LEWIS SPENCE. (Rider and Co. Ltd., London. 6*s.*)

The patient is not quite dead; but the marks of decay are upon the body! It is to be expected, therefore, that we shall have a spate of books from the diagnosticians as to the causes of the fatal malady that has overtaken Civilization, accompanied by essays from those who are anxious to ensure an immediate and brighter reincarnation of the deceased-to-be into a more propitious environment. These three volumes, in their differing ways, are attempts to discover the source of the evils that afflict us and to suggest remedies, in certain directions, for the avoidance of future ills. Baron Palmstierna believes that we must work in the spirit of the statement of H. H. the late Maharajah of Baroda :—

> Let us humbly and in a spirit of partnership combine against the common enemies, Ignorance, Selfishness, and Materialism. Religions may differ, but Religion is one.

His search is for the organic elements of religious experience, and, in his discussion of those essential features, he is not afraid of drawing the conclusions that "none of the religions has been altogether alien to the thought that man's spirit or soul may have preexisted," and (in a chapter headed "Karma") that "no Saviour can relieve man from his own responsibility." But, while it may be possible to get the adherents of extant Faiths upon the same platform, where they may agree benevolently to differ, it is another matter to visualize paid priests and commercialized ecclesiastical institutions venturing to give up their vested interests in the ardent pursuit of Truth. We have seen what happened to a League of Nations that followed the dictates of a so-called "enlightened" self-interest. It is to be feared that much the same fate lies in wait for any League of Religions that is not prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice of sectarianism in all its devious forms.

Mr. Cyril Scott is under no doubt at all that we are where we are because we have worshipped at the altars of false gods. He, too, is concerned at the rejection by official Christianity of the ancient teachings of Reincarnation and Karma. Further, in a reference to the *Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine (1938)*, he suggests that had the Church studied "Esoteric Science, or Yoga," it would know that there is a subtler scheme of Evolution "operating concurrently with our material scheme." Having regard, however, to what the Church, as an institution, has made of the teaching of Jesus, it is rather terrifying to think of what it could have done, or might do, to either theoretical or practical Yoga in the true sense! None-the-less, Mr. Cyril Scott has some cogent criticisms to make of orthodox religion and science, and, in particular, his condemnation of vivisection is unsparing. It is a pity that more writers on psychic and occult subjects do not realize that vivisection is Sorcery, pure and simple, as H. P. Blavatsky long ago described it. Mr. Cyril Scott wants peace to be built upon the ethics of the "Prince of Peace." His book may help to this end by stirring the

stagnant waters of complacency.

Mr. Lewis Spence does not beat about the bush! For him, Germany is "the everlasting Faust among the world's peoples," presumably with Lucifer in person presiding over its rulers, the Satanic aim being "the destruction and extirpation of the Christian Faith." His analysis of Nazi policy, apart from his premise, has value because he has not forgotten the rôle of Dr. Arthur Rosenberg in formulating the thesis of racial superiority. He would appear to be somewhat confused in his own mind as to what is the Christian Faith; but he has sought, and thinks he has found, evidence establishing the existence of a "mysterious and well-concealed body of Satanist or Luciferian origin," which possesses "a deep-seated hatred of the Christian Faith." In his excursion into the realm of Demonology, he refers to the Rev. Montague Summers's translation of *Malleus Maleficarum*. We had thought that the work in question, so valuable in its source material, showed that medieval demonology was far more exemplified in the Roman Catholic Church than in the victims of the Church's persecutions. However that may be, we can agree with Mr. Spence that "For the future, a genuine spiritual re-awakening must herald the new day of man's rebirth." Perhaps, in all these testimonies by expert witnesses, the ultimate truth is to be found in the words of the *Bhagavad Gita*:—

> These two, Light and Darkness, are the world's eternal ways.

B. P. HOWELL

Germans Beyond Germany: An Anthology. Edited with Biographical Notes and an Introduction by VILEM HAAS. (The International Book House Ltd., Bombay. Rs. 4/-)

In this book Mr. Vilem Haas, a Czecho-Slovakian scholar now a refugee in India, has brought together English translations of extracts from the works of thirteen representative German men of letters of the nineteenth century. These authors are described as "Germans beyond Germany" in more senses than one. Some of them, Heine, Börne, Georg Büchner, Nietzsche and Feuerbach, for instance, lived as exiles outside Germany, either voluntarily or of necessity: they were hence, geographically speaking, Germans beyond the confines of Germany. Again, there were German thinkers, notably Goethe, Hoelderlin and Nietzsche, who, while drawing their inspiration from the deep springs of their racial identity, nevertheless had the vision and the courage to see clearly and to criticize boldly the many sore spots that disfigured Germany and jeopardised its future. Lastly, there were humanists like Kant, Büchner and Heine who were Europeans first and Germans only afterwards. The "Germans beyond Germany," whether they belonged to one or another or all of these groups, were able at once to interpret the Germans to other peoples and also to tell their own compatriots roundly what exactly was wrong with them.

In *Germans Beyond Germany* we are thus enabled to see the Germans as they appeared to some of their own choicest spirits. The book is, as it were, a self-portrait of the German mind, a portrait that is as challengingly real

as it is courageously honest. It is difficult to believe that all these extracts were written long before Hitler and his associates mobilised the resources of the German nation into a potent and ruthless engine of destruction on a world-wide scale. Goethe and Hoelderlin and Nietzsche and the rest seem rather to denounce the very qualities that have reached their stupefying apotheosis in the Germany of today.

Mr. Vilem Haas's long introduction is a serious attempt at analysing the central paradox of the German mind—its rigour and its power and also its ineradicable capacity for projecting Death and Dissolution in our midst. The paradox of the German mind is seemingly reflected also in the creative work of a Goethe, a Hoelderlin, a Schopenhauer, a Nietzsche. These were permeated by the German spirit and yet they hated the Germans with an almost fiendish, unqualified hatred. Germany was important, the State was everything, it was literally the God-State—but individual Germans were vermin, they hardly mattered.

Mr. Haas institutes a telling contrast between the Vedantic ideal of suppressing and merging the Ego in the one Supreme Reality and the German ideal of suppressing and merging the Ego in the daily life of the God-State. The average German, it would appear, is willing, is indeed most eager, to surrender his all at the behest of the God-State, or its Fuehrer; he is presumably moved by the ecstasy of dying and causing death and the suicidal event is a mystic flame that rushes him onward to his promised goal. This is the clue to the Germans' glorification of blood and iron, the fatal fascination for them of the *thandav*, dance of death.

Mr. Haas's diagnosis seems to be somewhat of an over-simplification. However, he has got up his case with considerable care and his conclusions and the illustrative extracts he has put together deserve to be examined with attention and sympathy. Hitler, after all, is no piece of foreign matter accidentally cast on modern Germany ; he is rather the logical development of certain strands in the German mind that had been there for several generations past. Mr. Haas's book is a timely publication because it will prove as useful as *Mein Kampf* itself in revealing the sinuosities that constitute the monstrous tangle that is Hitler's mind.

The book under notice is well printed and bound in yellow khadi at the Sadhana Press, Baroda. It is satisfactory to note that within a year of its inception this press has made a creditable name for itself among printing firms in India.

K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"_____ends of verse
And sayings of philosophers."
HUDIBRAS

India's poverty at the present time imposes plain living willy-nilly, and to the point of penury, upon too many of our fellow-citizens, but to accept plain living with a good grace is something more than to make a virtue of necessity. The paramountcy of idea over form, of spirit and mind over matter, is widely accepted in India, where, time out of mind, plain living has been the recognized concomitant of high thinking. But between plain living and stark penury there is a gulf as wide as that between the former and luxury. We should not rest content until the necessities of life are within reach of every man, woman and child. Let us beware, however, of the fallacy that the farther we can go beyond that, the better. Increasing the number of wants is the first ingredient in the accepted Western formula for prosperity, which presupposes some measure of purchasing power to start with: Increased demand= increased production=wider employment, better hours, better wages=increased purchasing power. The question whether people are better off for wanting an increasing number of things is rarely faced as squarely as by Shri J. C. Kumarappa in *Gram Udyog Patrika* for June where, in considering "The Non-violent Standard of Life," he condemns the artificial stimulation of demand.

> We get an eternal struggle for more and more...leaving the people always discontented.... Persons who are victims of this scheme of increasing the income by raised standards of living are on a par with the donkey before which its driver has dangled a much coveted carrot hanging from a stick fixed to its own harness. The more the animal runs to get at the carrot, the further is the cart drawn. The driver gets his work done and the carrot remains. Under this scheme the industrialists get the goods made and sold but the life of the people is not enriched.

It may be necessary at the moment to cut our coat according to our cloth, but let us not deceive ourselves by fancying if the cloth is inadequate that the fit will be satisfactory. It is well to know that improvements can be effected in inadequate diets without very great increase in expenditure, as Dr. W. R. Aykroyd, Director of the Nutrition Research Laboratories, Coonoor, brings out in the third revised edition of Health Bulletin No. 23, *The Nutritive Value of Indian Foods and the Planning of Satisfactory Diets*.

He dwells especially on the necessarily inadequate diets provided in children's homes which attempt the impossible task of feeding their boarders properly for Rs. 3/- per head per month or less. Take the growing child's requirement of milk. Western nutrition workers demand over a seer of milk per child per day for optimum results. It is suggested by "An Indian Dietician" in *The Hindustan Review* for June that "It is desirable that children should consume upwards of 8 ozs. of milk a

day," that quantity, he admits, being below that recommended as "optimum" by nutrition workers elsewhere. If even that is not available—and in how many million cases it is not, our shockingly low disease-resistance as a nation and our disgraceful mortality figures testify—then butter-milk or skimmed milk from skimmed-milk powder are recommended. The latter, many children's homes in India are reported to be supplying with markedly good effects.

We are badly in need of more dietetic knowledge and this Government publication should prove useful. It contains a wealth of information on the superiority to milled rice of whole rice, whole wheat or ragi, the importance of green vegetables, fruits and fats, the value of ground-nuts, etc. But—and it is an emphatic "but"—let us not be satisfied with half-way houses, or flatter ourselves that because Indian children can be kept alive on skimmed milk in sub-optimum quantities therefore nothing further is needed. Life can be sustained on far less than is required for the health and vigour without which life may be a burden. Granting that milk both qualitatively and quantitatively inadequate is preferable to none, let us keep rigorously before us the ideal set by nutrition workers elsewhere and not rest satisfied with less. If a seer of milk a day for every growing child in India is economically unthinkable—as with the present economic structure it undeniably is—then the solution is not acquiescence in lower standards, except temporarily and under protest, but the reform of the economic system.

It is not easy to divert an addict from drink unless he is provided with some counter-attraction. Recreation of some kind is necessary to give him the needed rest and stimulation. Shri V. G. Ramakrishna Aiyar of the Annamalai University, writing in *The Mysore Economic Journal* for June 1942 on "Prohibition at Work in Madras" shows how in making prohibition a success it was necessary to organise amusement in a large number of villages. Rural sports, street dramas and folk dances, games and parties where devotional songs or *Bhajans* were sung, proved the most popular of the recreations encouraged in Salem and in other districts with gratifying results. The value of such diversions, offering healthy activity of body and of mind, is not confined to weaning the addict from his cups and so improving physique and morale and relieving the strain on the commonly precarious domestic budget. Prohibition or none, the value of the right kind of recreation can hardly be overstressed. A normal and balanced life needs it. If provided with discrimination, recreation can not merely provide relaxation from workaday existence but can also serve educative and cultural ends. Study of nature, the reading of good books, listening to excellent music and witnessing or participating in elevating dramatic performances are types of recreation both enlightening and purposive. May not the steady encouragement of such types of recreation not only help to relieve the monotony of rural routine but also put the villager in course of time beyond the reach of contamination by cheap and debasing modes of relaxation?

One of the greatest handicaps to the rehabilitation of the Indian village, the desirability of which needs no argument, is the inertia into which so

many of our village folk have fallen. Stripped by a short-sighted government policy of their old autonomy, with the incentive which it offered to civic pride and individual effort, the villages have in too many cases lost their zest for life. There are two kinds of peace, too often confused—the dull inertia of the stone and the rhythmic balance of the starry heavens. Harmonious movement we may call the peace of Sattwa, but the peace of the clod is Tamas.

Not the least function of village recreation is to awaken dormant energy, to arouse faculties benumbed and torpid from disuse to active exercise.

The thoughtful everywhere are looking beyond this war and the ghastly destruction and suffering it entails to the new order which must emerge. Competitive and exclusive nationalism must give way to co-operative and liberal internationalism. Science and culture know no country. The resources of Nature and of man have no nationality. " The world is coming closer and closer together. All important problems are tending to become international problems in our day and they will tend more in the same direction in the coming years." Thus writes the Editor of *The Indian Social Reformer* (June 6th) and he rightly makes application of this principle to our national life :—

> Western culture is an important strand without which Indian culture would be incomplete. Christian influence must also have a part in the future Indian ethos as much as the Hindu and Muslim influence. Western science and Western organization are the cement which can hold together the various elements in the Indian population.

Mr. Harold J. Laski pleads in *The New Statesman and Nation* for 11th April against the short-sighted thinking which sees victory as the one objective, which once achieved, our problems will, if not actually solve themselves, at least lend themselves docilely to solution. His article on "Mr. Churchill's Conception of Victory" is of non-partisan interest for the clear light it throws on the necessity for recognising the present war as more than a conflict of military forces on an international scale.

There are many whose conception of victory is what Mr. Laski describes as " static," who fail to realise that the immense changes in economic and social structure which the war has enforced will make it impossible to take up our problems where we figuratively laid them down when the war began. It has been suggested that our economic theorists, in attempting to isolate interrelated problems, argue as though if there were ten birds on a tree, and one was shot, there would still be nine birds on the tree. This is a transition period in which traditions, customs, outlooks, economic, social and philosophical no less than political, are in the melting-pot. What will emerge we cannot now foresee but of one thing we can be sure: the post-war world will be a different world from that which we have known.

And it is when things are in flux that changes are easiest. Human institutions tend all too soon to set in rigid moulds that crib and cabin the expanding life. It sometimes takes a cataclysm like the present one to break the moulds. There has been too much of injustice and misery in the social and economic structure that we have had. The exploitation of the common man is by no means confined to enemy

territory. It is surely legitimate to look to those who have come forward as his champions, in the name of justice and democracy, to give an earnest of their genuine concern for his well-being now. Now, while in every country men are keyed to sacrifice in the name of the common weal, now, while the metal is molten, is the time to pour it into nobler, juster moulds. After the heat of conflict has died down the metal will become progressively less malleable.

People everywhere feel the deep conviction that the war is in fact a revolutionary epoch in our history; and they resent the effort of party machines and party leaders to evade its implications at a moment when the historical situation offers us the prospect of that psychological flexibility which permits a swift access to a new social equilibrium.

Dorothy Thompson in her article, "This War and the Common Sense of Women" (*Ladies' Home Journal* for April 1942), remarks that "Even in war we are forced to realize that we are all members one of another." Hers is a fervent appeal to the women of her country:—

See to it—*you* see to it—that this war degenerates into neither sheer aimless destruction, nor burdensome and antiquated imperialism. *You* see to it that this war ends, as it began for us and for our allies, as a war of liberation.

To achieve this, she explains, it is necessary to build "a world that is all of a piece, *in its mind.*" The main issue is to determine whether our world is to be run co-operatively or not. Common sense and the simplest human experiences agree with the teachings of all great religious leaders in declaring that "It is better to give than to receive." She mentions Moses, Confucius and Jesus as having showed the way of mutual love and partnership, the way most women believe in and the only way worth fighting for.

This war is futile unless we fight it for a new world of co-operation. It is futile if by it we are trying to destroy the German and Japanese nations, or trying to enslave them. It must be fought for equality: equality of right—which does not mean, necessarily, identity of function.

Gandhiji, in his interview late in June with Mr. Preston Grover, the representative of the Associated Press of America, castigated the failure of the U. S. A. to bring pressure to bear on her Ally in behalf of subject India. The reason is not far to seek and indeed was pointedly hinted at by Gandhiji himself when he referred to that country's having yet to abolish slavery at home. There is nothing that so cramps a would-be reformer's style as the consciousness of the same shortcomings in himself or in his direct sphere of responsibility as those against which he inveighs in others. To segregate Negroes as the Southern States do—in trains, in schools, in churches—to deny them, in practice if not by statute, equality of opportunity at the polls, in the courts and in the economic field, and then to deplore untouchability in India, to denounce exploitation, to decry the holding of a reluctant people in subjection to an imperialistic power, would be to play the hypocrite with a vengeance.

The Social Welfare is to be congratulated on publishing a series of articles on "Uncle Tom's Children: The Negro in America." The encouraging note is the evidence for a quickened social conscience in white America which Shri Chandrashanker Shukla brings out in that series in quotations from American

periodicals. *The Nation* is traditionally the friend of justice and fair play. And *The New Republic* has been making very embarrassing thrusts at white complacency which we hope will be pressed home. As the situation stands, the U. S. A. is, as *The New Republic* suggested apropos of the law's indecisiveness on equal treatment for Negroes in Southern trains, "making a mockery of the theory that we are fighting for democracy." China and Russia could plead with a good grace for a free India; the United States at present cannot.

The cause of the democracies in this war has been weakened from the first by professions' outstripping practice or, rather, by practice's belying professions. Excess cargo that has not seriously embarrassed a ship in fair weather may have to be jettisoned when the ship is labouring in heavy seas. The time has come for the democracies to cry, "Overboard with racial discrimination and imperialism!" so that the United Nations' ship can ride the gale.

The Negro problem is perhaps too near for most Americans to see in its proper perspective. Short-sighted individuals, however, sometimes see very well at a distance. The Editor of *The Saturday Evening Post*, in his leader of March 14th under the caption "Humpty Dumpty," sees very plainly indeed that white imperialism in Asia "has had a great fall, and all our men and all our planes cannot put Humpty Dumpty together again, even if we wished." And Asia, he of course concedes, includes the Philippines.

The Americans, he writes, have learned, in a way they will not soon forget, their dependence on the Orient for rubber, tin, silk, tea and spices. They have, moreover, "learned abruptly that the Asiatic is not an inferior fighting man." Another lesson which he commends to the attention of his countrymen is that, regardless of the outcome of the war, the curtain has fallen with finality upon the two-century era during which "the white man, the pukka sahib, dominated much of Asia, dealing with the natives as inferior and subject peoples." And he adds:—

> If it is true, as we believe, that the white man's Asia is gone forever, outmoded in time, then the quicker Great Britain and the Netherlands realize and act upon this fact, the better for them and the better for us. It is easy to give away other people's empires, but what is the alternative?

It is a straight question which he puts to his countrymen, one to which justice and expediency alike demand a straight answer—whether, at the war's end, they intend to ask their Chinese allies to hand back to the white man the colonies and concessions which Japan has taken over temporarily, whether they stand committed to restoring "the white man's Asia in China, Indo-China, Malaya, the Netherlands East Indies, Burma, India." Upon the answer, he suggests, may depend in no small measure the co-operation of the Asiatic peoples and the duration and the outcome of the war.

The greatest danger lies in allowing the heat of the battle to make us forgetful of the simple fundamental truths which can alone save us from the greatest possible loss—the loss of the Soul. Another citizen of the U.S.A., Milton Mayer, discussing "The Case Against the Jew" in *The Saturday Evening Post* (March 28th) warns

against this danger thus :—

The Jews of America are afraid that their number is up—if not today, then tomorrow or the next. They know that war breeds chauvinism and that chauvinism breeds bigotry. They know that every war since Napoleon has been followed by collapse, and they know that the postwar collapse will remind a bitter and bewildered nation that "the Jews got us into the war." The Jews of America are afraid.

In their fear of anti-Semitism which, alas, has existed in the U. S. A. as well as in Europe, the Jews have been for long years now trying to sink their identity through what Mr. Mayer, himself a born Israelite, calls a process of "adjustment." He describes their pitiful attempts at losing themselves by every possible dodge, "from changing their names to changing their faces," and all to no avail—they have been merely "tolerated" by the Gentiles and they themselves have not forgotten they are Jews. The solution Mr. Mayer offers the Jew is that of following the path of righteousness. Therein lies his salvation and that of the modern world in which he lives and to the weaknesses of which he has pandered up till now. What is our modern civilization ? Writes Mr. Mayer :—

The modern world had as its ideals money, fame and power. The pursuit of money, fame and power as the ends of life was bound to be frustrating, because there is no such thing as enough money, fame and power.

With remarkably clear sight he analyses the evils of a materialistic way of life and makes a passionate plea for a return to the old way of the prophets, Jesus included. For Christendom has not been a Christian world, even though it has been a Gentile one. It has had "the freedom to worship God" but "no God to worship!" By "worship of God" is meant a life of righteousness. "The righteous man is the man whose bodily goods serve the goods of the spirit." And similarly "the unrighteous man is the man whose bodily goods begin by being ends in themselves and end by devouring the spirit." And such righteousness is consonant with freedom, although, judged by modern materialistic standards, it is both radical and impractical. But in the long run the modern way leads to destruction and death. To wit—the case of the Jews who "refused to be God's chosen people and now, in the end, they are Hitler's." Mr. Mayer sees in their failure a sign to all men, "a sign that men cannot survive by saving their skins." So the choice before the Jew is the choice before each one of us—righteousness or death. "The Jew who wants to be saved will have to save himself."

Running away hasn't saved him. Resettlement hasn't saved him. Changing his name, his face, his clothes and his faith hasn't saved him. The Jew has not been saved. And the suddenly crowded temples won't save him. Denouncing Coughlin won't save him. The destruction of Hitler won't save him. All these fallacious faiths are based on the grand fallacy of adjustment. The Jew will be saved when he saves his own soul.

And that is true of every man.

The query, "What can one man do ?" so often offered in ineffectual extenuation of doing nothing, is answered, when at all, by practical demonstration, not in words. Such practical demonstration was given by David Hare, watch-maker, the centenary of whose death furnishes the occasion for Shri Nirmal Chandra Sinha's appreciation in *The Calcutta Municipal Gazette* of 13th June, "A Watch-maker in Calcutta : 1800-1842." Himself an ill-

educated artisan, Hare espoused the cause of Indian education with a zeal that put to shame the indifference of his educational and cultural superiors. Hare was conscious of his intellectual limitations but not borne down by them. It is a testimony to his solid worth that he was the friend and the coadjutor of Raja Rammohan Roy. But he did not play only a secondary rôle. He was the prime mover of the Hindu College, the success of which is credited with having paved the way for Indian education on Western lines, an achievement of significance on whichever side of the ledger the net results of such education must be entered. He agitated also for the extension and improvement of the indigenous schools and for the publication of books in the Indian languages. He worked for the education of girls and for the Medical College and the hospital in connection with it.

He did not spare himself for the moral and social uplift of the country of his adoption. His purse was not very long and yet it was always open for the distressed, particularly those among the students. In the midst of his heavy work for education, he could make time and spirit to join the movements for the freedom of the press and for checking the emigration of ignorant labourers to Mauritius....

Shy and retiring, Hare kept himself in the background and sought no laurels, but five thousand Hindus are said to have followed the hearse of this unassuming friend of India.

Much of the first part of Prof. Leonard J. Russell's discussion of "Ideals and Practice" in *Philosophy*, April 1942, is given to the demonstration of the extreme dubiety of any ready-made guide to conduct. Even the Golden Rule is called into question in the dead-letter sense. Others, he suggests, may not in the least desire to be treated by us as we should like to be by them.

Professor Russell gives the example of the rule of truthfulness, which he concedes "might conceivably have absolute validity." But there is no isolated instance of telling the truth as an unrelated act. "It may be in addition an instance of doing justice, of breaking someone's heart, of revenge, of breaking a promise—it can be all these at once." And he insists on the need of right knowledge as well as of right motive if behaviour is to lead to satisfactory consequences.

Even those who start with principles claiming absolute validity are compelled to supplement these principles by reference to the spirit of a Way of Life, which cannot be given the precision and definiteness which is necessary for absolute validity.

The test which he suggests for an acceptable Way of Life is not very different from the rule of conduct laid down by Kant: "Act only on that maxim whereby thou canst at the same time will that it should become a universal Law." For Professor Russell

the best Way of Life for man seems to involve at least the prediction that if all of us (or a sufficiently large number of us) were to live in the actual world in accordance with its principles, seeking to bring about the types of situation asserted by it to be good, then, to the extent to which we succeeded, our life would be judged by us to be better in all important respects than our present life: importance here being determined not only in the light of the Way, but in the light of what we ourselves should become, if we followed the Way.

Such a test could be met by the Way of Life preached and followed by all the great Teachers; hardly by any

other. The ideal, whether as isolated principle or Way of Life, may be beyond present attainment for the rest of us, but there can be no deliberate compromise. The best as one sees it is imperative—and by our unavoidable mistakes we learn.

That freedom of the pen is more than liberty from restraint from bureaucrats and censors was well brought out by Prof. Irwin Edman of Columbia University in an address before the American Institute of Graphic Arts which is printed in *The New York Times Book Review* for 8th March 1942.

> The printed word is a condition but not a guarantee of liberty....Deeper than the political conditions of freedom is the climate of opinion in which spontaneity flourishes.

The climate of opinion has probably never been favourable to reform movements in their inception. Professor Edman cites the often bitterly contested efforts of minorities, with the printed word as their chief implement, to bring about many reforms now generally accepted as beneficent—"the abolition of slavery, the reform of barbarous criminal and legal procedure, the extension of rights and privileges to women, to workers and to religiou minorities," and he pleads for "th right of dissident opinion, even in wa time." His, we fear, is a voice cryin in the wilderness. Intolerance is spread ing like a dark cloud between us and th sun. Political orthodoxy has becom more menacing than religious, where indeed, the two tyrants have not joine forces, with "Agree or keep silent" a the modern variant of "Conform o perish!"

Professor Edman cites Spinoza' noble brief for civil and religious lib erties, the *Tractatus Theologico-Polit icus*, in which he brings out at the en that these liberties are after all "simply the permissive conditions for the fre life of the spirit." Professor Edman writes :—

> The importance of maintaining politica freedom is that there may be, in a deepe sense, human freedom, the flowering of th spirit in the diverse and spontaneous an contagious ways in which it does flower i the creative mind and in the lyric arts of th word. In the long run and in the mos fundamental analysis, the democratic fait is this: that those institutions are wort living for and dying for which promote th flowering of life in individuals....It is the flo of books, of ideas, of emotions communicate with intensity and with discipline, tha nourish souls in our society.